

The Educational Record

Published Quarterly by

The American Council on Education

Volume 2

January, 1921

No. 1

Editor:

SAMUEL PAUL CAPEN

CONTENTS

New Educational Bills

By the Editor

The Fess-Capper Bill for the Promotion of Physical Education

By E. Dana Caulkins

The Reasons for a National Survey of State Universities

By M. L. Burton

A National Survey of State Universities

By Samuel P. Capen

A Visit to the American University Union in Europe

By J. W. Cunliffe

The American Council on Education

By the Editor

Educational Research

Annual Subscription, \$2.00

COPYRIGHT, 1921

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

New Educational Bills

WITH the reassembling of Congress in December and the prospective advent of a new administration, the situation with respect to Congressional legislation bearing on education has apparently changed. The measures introduced during the last session are, in so far as they have not been acted upon and disposed of, still before Congress. The issues of the Educational Record for January and April, 1920, carried summaries of the principal bills bearing on education. None of the major propositions looking toward a re-organization and expansion of the Government's educational activities was passed at the last session.

The change in the situation is due to other influences. During the last session various measures were introduced looking toward a scientific re-organization of the executive departments of the Government (see, for example, Educational Record Vol. 1, pages 20 and 47). At the time of their introduction these measures did not (with one exception) receive consideration. In the interval between the sessions, however, political events have combined to focus the attention of members of Congress especially on measures of this character. The opinion seems now to prevail that before any bills are passed creating new departments and enlarging the scope of the Government's participation in promoting education, health or social welfare, there should be a general overhauling of the Government's executive machinery, probably with a final regrouping of services. Factors contributing to this trend of opinion are the probability of the passage of budget legislation in the near future, the endorsement by the President-elect of the creation of a Department of Public Welfare, and the strong backing by engineering interests and others of the proposal for a Department of Public Works. The budget is expected to reveal duplications and the separation of cognate services. The movements behind the propositions for various kinds of new departments (health, education, public welfare, public works, etc.), are so strong that some additions to the Cabinet are almost certain to be made eventually. Each movement, however, is fostered by a special interest which takes little thought of the effect on the Government service as a whole.

of the particular measure which it endorses. Hence, the view that the larger question of Government re-organization must be set on the way to solution before new departments are created. These conclusions are borne out both by the action already taken by Congress in the few days that have elapsed since the opening of the session and by the new measures introduced. The following paragraphs present a summary of the more important recent enactments and new bills.

On December 17 Congress passed Senate Joint Resolution 191 and sent it to the President for his signature. The substance of the resolution follows:

**JOINT RESOLUTION TO CREATE A JOINT COMMITTEE ON
THE RE-ORGANIZATION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE
BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT**

Creates a joint committee consisting of three members of the Senate and three members of the House of Representatives to make a survey of the administrative services of the Government for the purposes of securing all pertinent facts concerning their powers and duties, their distribution among the several executive departments and their overlapping and duplication of authority; also to determine what redistribution of activities should be made among the several services with a view to the proper correlation of the same and what departmental regrouping of services should be made so that each executive department shall embrace only services having close working relations with each other.

The committee is instructed to report from time to time to both the House and the Senate, to prepare and submit bills looking toward the coordination of Government functions and to make a final report within two years.

The creation of two new executive departments and the extensive re-organization of existing departments are sought in a comprehensive measure introduced December 7 by Senator McCormick. The bill contains nine chapters. The portions of particular interest to persons concerned with education are summarized below.

**THE McCORMICK BILL FOR THE COORDINATION OF THE
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND THE CREATION OF A
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND A DEPARTMENT
OF PUBLIC WELFARE.**

S. 4542

CHAPTER No. 1

1. Changes the name of the Department of the Interior to the Department of Public Works. The Secretary of the Department shall hereafter be known as Secretary of Public Works.

2. Provides for the appointment of three Assistant Secretaries of Public Works at \$7,500 each.

3. Defines the province of the Department of Public Works as the fostering, development and conservation of the mineral, forest land and water resources of the United States, and the administration of public lands, parks and forests; the design, construction, maintenance and repair of all public works under the control of the United States, except such as are required exclusively for the use of the military and naval establishments in providing for national defense.

4. Authorizes the Department of Public Works to act as the agent of other executive departments in the design, construction and maintenance of public works. For the facilitation of this an especial Public Works Fund is authorized to be set aside in the Department of the Treasury.

5. The Department of Public Works is to control the allotment of space in Government buildings (except the White House, the Capitol and the Senate and House Office Buildings) for the use of the several Government activities.

6. Transfers to the Secretary of Public Works the authority and powers of the Secretary of War relating to the improvement of rivers and harbors and other engineering duties now exercised by the Chief of Engineers in connection with waterways, roads, bridges, etc., unless such public works are for the exclusive use of the military establishment in providing for the national defense.

7. Transfers the following offices with their current unexpended appropriations to the Department of Public Works:

The General Land Office from the Department of the Interior.

The Geological Survey from the Department of the Interior.

The Bureau of Mines from the Department of the Interior.

The Reclamation Service from the Department of the Interior.

The National Parks Service from the Department of the Interior.

The Division of Capitol Grounds and Buildings from the Department of the Interior.

The Alaskan Engineering Commission from the Department of the Interior.

The Office of the Supervising Architect from the Department of the Treasury.

The Bureau of Public Roads from the Department of Agriculture.

The Forest Service from the Department of Agriculture.

The Office of the Superintendent of the State, War and Navy Department Buildings.

The Commission of Fine Arts.

The Boards and Commissions of the War Department principally employed in the supervision or prosecution of engineering works.

8. Provides for the detail of army officers now engaged in the foregoing activities to the Department of Public Works for a period not exceeding two years. The future details of members of the Corps of Engineers are to be for the purpose of acquiring training or experience.

9. Transfers to the Secretary of Public Works supervision over certain national military parks, battlefields, etc.

10. The Secretary of Public Works is authorized to make such changes in and consolidations of bureaus and offices included in the Department of Public Works as may be essential to economical and effective service.

CHAPTER NO. 2

1. Creates a Department of Public Welfare with a Secretary in the President's Cabinet and provides for the appointment of three Assistant Secretaries of Public Welfare at \$7,500 each.

2. Transfers the following bureaus and offices with their unexpended current appropriations to the Department of Public Welfare:

The Office of Indian Affairs from the Department of the Interior.

The United States Indian Service from the Department of the Interior.

The Bureau of Pensions from the Department of the Interior.

The Bureau of Education from the Department of the Interior.

Saint Elizabeth's Hospital from the Department of the Interior.

Howard University from the Department of the Interior.

Freedmen's Hospital from the Department of the Interior.

The Bureau of War Risk Insurance from the Department of the Treasury.

The Office of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service from the Department of the Treasury.

The Public Health Service from the Department of the Treasury.

The Children's Bureau from the Department of Labor.

The Women's Bureau from the Department of Labor.

3. Abolishes the Board of Indian Commissioners and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, transferring the functions of the latter to the Bureau of Pensions.

4. Abolishes the Federal Board for Vocational Education and transfers the functions conferred upon the Board under the Smith-Hughes Act to the Bureau of Education. Authorizes the Secretary of Public Welfare to perform the functions conferred on the Federal Board for Vocational Education under the act providing for vocational rehabilitation of disabled soldiers, sailors and marines through such instrumentalities as he may select.

5. Abolishes the United States Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board and transfers its powers and duties to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

6. Places in the Department of Public Welfare the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and the Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

7. Authorizes the Secretary of Public Welfare, with the approval of the President, to make such changes in the organization of the bureaus and offices transferred to his department as may be essential to economical and effective administration.

Two aspects of this measure will be of especial interest to persons concerned with education. It provides for a partial coordination of certain of the Government's educational offices.

These are grouped, however, with a large collection of services, the major part of which are concerned with public health. The bill provides for no federal subsidies for welfare purposes in addition to the grants already administered through one or another of the offices transferred to the new department.

Coincidentally with the introduction of the bill, Senator McCormick introduced Senate Resolution 393 providing for the appointment of a special committee of the Senate to consider measures for the re-organization of the executive departments and the creation of a Department of Public Works and a Department of Public Welfare.

THE KENYON BILL FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT
OF A DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WELFARE
S. 4543

1. Creates a Department of Social Welfare with a Secretary in the President's Cabinet and an Assistant Secretary at \$5,000 a year.

2. States that "it shall be the province and duty of said department to safeguard and promote the social welfare of the people of the United States."

3. Transfers with current unexpended appropriations the following offices to the Department of Social Welfare:

The Public Health Service from the Department of the Treasury.

The Hygienic Laboratory from the Department of the Treasury.

The Bureau of Education from the Department of the Interior.

The Children's Bureau from the Department of Labor.

The Bureau of Industrial Housing and Transportation from the Department of Labor.

The United States Employment Service from the Department of Labor.

The United States Employees' Compensation Commission from the Department of Labor.

The Office of Home Economics from the Department of Agriculture.

4. The Secretary of Social Welfare is empowered to re-arrange the statistical work of the bureaus and offices transferred to the new department, to consolidate the statistical and information services and to collate and publish the statistical information secured through these offices in such manner as he sees fit.

5. The Secretary of Social Welfare is directed to make special investigations and reports.

6. The President is authorized to transfer to the Department of Social Welfare at any time the whole or part of any bureau or office engaged in work relating to the social welfare of the people of the United States.

This measure also is without additional federal subsidy features. It contemplates primarily a regrouping of related services in the interests of governmental efficiency. The reader will doubtless be struck, however, by the dissimilarity

between the lists of offices transferred in the one case to the Department of Public Welfare by the McCormick bill and in the other to the Department of Social Welfare by the Kenyon bill.

THE CAPPER-ROGERS BILL FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT IN
THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT OF A BUREAU OF
VETERAN RE-ESTABLISHMENT

S. 4613 and H. R. 14961

1. Creates a Bureau of Veteran Re-establishment in the Interior Department with a Director at a salary of \$10,000 a year.
2. Transfers to the Bureau of Veteran Re-establishment the functions and duties, with respect to the vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, conferred by existing laws upon the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and the Federal Board for Vocational Education. Transfers also the functions imposed on the United States Public Health Service to provide hospital and sanitary facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors and marines.
3. Makes available for the Bureau of Veteran Re-establishment the sums heretofore appropriated for the relief and education of disabled soldiers through the three above named agencies.

THE SHEPHERD-TOWNER BILL
FOR THE PROTECTION OF MATERNITY AND INFANCY

S. 3259 and H. R. 10925

In the Educational Record Volume 1, No. 1, page 17 the Shepherd-Towner Bill was summarized. During the first days of the present session of Congress this measure has been acted upon by the Senate. It was passed by the Senate with amendments December 18, 1920. Its principal provisions now are the following:

1. Appropriates \$480,000 annually—\$10,000 for each state—and an additional \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, the annual appropriation after that date not to exceed \$1,480,000, for promoting the care of maternity and infancy in the several states.
2. States must match the additional appropriations over and above the \$10,000 appropriated for the first year. The distribution of the additional appropriations is to be in the proportion which the population of each state bears to the total population of the United States. Five per cent of the appropriation may be used for the administration expenses of the federal office.
3. The fund is to be administered by the Children's Bureau which is to consist of the Secretary of Labor, the Chief of the Children's Bureau, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and the Commissioner of Education. The Children's Bureau as thus constituted shall make

studies and investigations tending to promote the efficient administration of the act.

4. States accepting the act shall administer the provisions of it through a child welfare or child hygiene division in the state agency of health. The Children's Bureau may recommend to the state agencies cooperating under this act the appointment of advisory committees both state and local, half of whose members shall be women.

5. State agencies must submit to the Children's Bureau detailed plans for carrying out the provisions of the act, such plans to include provisions for state administration for instruction in the hygiene of maternity and infancy through public health nurses, consultation centers, etc. "If these plans are in conformity with the provisions of the act and reasonably appropriate and adequate to carry out its purpose, due notice of approval shall be sent to the state agency by the Chief of the Children's Bureau."

6. State agencies are authorized to arrange with state universities, land grant colleges or other public educational institutions for the provision of popular non-technical instruction in the subjects of the hygiene of infancy, the hygiene of maternity, etc., but not to exceed 25 per cent of the amounts granted by the United States can be spent for this part of the work.

7. The Children's Bureau may withhold the allotment of monies to any state whenever it shall be determined that such monies are not being expended for the purposes and under the conditions of this act.

It will be noted that the amendments introduced by the Senate (a) reduce the maximum federal appropriations from \$4,000,000 to \$1,480,000 (b) provide for the central administration through a re-constituted Children's Bureau instead of through a new Board (c) specify the designation of State Boards of Health as local administrative agencies (d) minimize the powers of the Federal office with respect to the approval of local plans.

The Fess-Capper Bill for the Promotion of Physical Education¹

THE Fess-Capper Bill (H. R. 12652 and S. 3950) has been receiving the strong support of many Congressmen and citizens throughout the nation who believe that it proposes a sound plan for improving the health and physical efficiency of the youth. Popular interest in this proposal has doubtless been stimulated by the publication of the draft statistics showing more than one-third of the young men disqualified from full military service because of physical defects and the reports showing a high percentage of school children suffering from physical defects most of which are preventable or remediable. There seems to have been a general sentiment that some sort of radical action would be necessary in order to set in motion an effective plan to combat these conditions. There have doubtless been many supporters of the proposal for compulsory military training who have been influenced mainly by the health and educational features of that plan.

Those who have been supporting the movement for Universal Physical Education for all persons between the ages of six and eighteen, through local, state and federal cooperation, have been of the opinion that training for health and physical efficiency should start earlier than provided in the compulsory military training law. They have further been of the opinion that both sexes should receive the training.

I do not wish to enter into any technical discussion of the scope of physical education but simply to explain that it now appears to be generally agreed that this subject should include:

(1) Practical instruction in the principles of healthful living (with emphasis upon the formation of health habits rather than the acquisition of health knowledge).

(2) Instruction and training in physical activities designed to

¹This article is contributed at the request of the editor by the Manager of the National Physical Education Service. It does not represent the views of any committee of the American Council on Education, but is presented in order that the membership of the Council may be informed of the opinions of the supporters of the Fess-Capper Bill.

develop all-round physical efficiency and a high degree of resistance to disease (the modern tendency is away from formal gymnastics and toward free play activities).

Now it is obvious that such a program of training can be carried out effectively on a nation-wide basis only through the cooperation of the educational and health agencies.

We will doubtless agree that every child ought to have this sort of a program as an essential part of the training for joyful and effective life. Without a sound basis of health and physical efficiency, the youth of the nation will profit little by whatever mental or moral training may be provided. The stress and strain of modern "civilized" life is such that today as never before the individual needs to be fortified with a sound physique and healthful habits for the maintenance of full physical efficiency. We have then to determine by what means every child in the nation may be given an opportunity to enjoy the benefits of physical education. Many local communities are making more or less adequate provision for this fundamental training. A few states are functioning in the stimulation and assistance of local communities, yet today, not more than one-tenth of the children of the nation are receiving training which even pretends to represent adequate physical education. There are only 5,500 trained physical directors in the entire nation, whereas 45,000 would be required to allow one supervisor for every group of 500 children.

Outside of New York all of the state legislatures together are appropriating annually less than \$200,000 for physical education. The practical question which we are facing is whether, because of adherence to a theory of government, which says "the less government, the better," we shall for the next fifty years deprive the majority of our children of a fair chance for health and normal physical development, or whether we shall bend our theory and provide for federal cooperation with the states with reasonable hope of the nation-wide establishment of physical education within a decade. There are two fundamental principles which I believe should be recognized in this sort of federal legislation, and if these principles are not already sufficiently recognized in the Fess-Capper Bill, I believe that measure should be properly amended:

(1) That the Federal Government should cooperate with the states financially and through lending technical advice, but should

not interfere with the autonomy of the states in the administration of the various physical education programs.

(2) That federal legislation should contain suitable specific requirements of the states in order that assurance may be given that the federal money appropriated will be effectively used.

Further, that the legislation should not give to any federal official or officials arbitrary authority to restrict the states in the expenditure of funds appropriated for carrying on the state physical education programs.

The Federal Government directly or indirectly places the burden of taxation upon the youth, as well as the adults of the nation. The Federal Government in times of national danger calls upon the young men of the nation to offer their lives in its defense. Has the Federal Government no responsibility for giving the youth of the nation at least the physical basis for an effective response to the various demands of citizenship? If the Federal Government has any responsibility at all for the "general welfare of the nation" what would be a more fundamental phase of this responsibility than its participation in giving every citizen fundamental training for health and bodily efficiency?

A study of the effect of federal cooperation with the states in the promotion of good roads, in the improvement of agriculture and in various other activities shows that this cooperation has resulted in hastening progress along these lines throughout the country.

I am confident that Senator Capper and Representative Fess have introduced their bills in Congress with the sincere purpose of setting in motion a program which will have a tremendous effect in promoting the physical welfare of the nation. I am certain that they are open minded on this subject and will be glad to receive helpful suggestions for the amendment of their measures. It is a simple matter to pick flaws in a proposal of this kind and give passive or active opposition. It is a more difficult matter to lend constructive criticism which will help strengthen a measure for the accomplishment of the beneficial results which all desire. We must decide whether we will stand by the theory of exclusive state responsibility or whether we will adopt the only practical means for the rapid and effective extension of physical education to all the youth of the nation.

E. DANA CAULKINS.

The Reasons for a National Survey of State Universities¹

It will be well for us to begin by defining the terms of our problem. We are asked to state the reasons for a national survey of State Universities. By "national" we assume that a nation-wide survey is contemplated. We do not understand that a survey organized or directed by any national bureau or outside organization is contemplated or necessarily involved. The survey which we are discussing is national only in the sense that it applies to a simultaneous study of all the institutions composing this association or at least to various homogeneous groups within the organization.

Perhaps it will be wise also to point out that by "survey" we mean "self-survey." This term, I believe was first used by Director Wm. H. Allen of the Public Service Institute. We are not discussing or advocating any plan which would invite outside organizations to investigate our universities. The wisdom or folly of such a policy lies beyond the scope of this paper. Our chief thought in this discussion is to secure information from all the State Universities regarding certain problems of interest to us all and to get it in such form that the data will be comparable. We have no thought of proposing a comprehensive all-inclusive, searching investigation of every detail of university work, administration and policy. Such a proposal would require millions of dollars and years of time for its successful prosecution. Perhaps the word "survey" is misleading unless it suggests a nation-wide view of our problems as they arise. The methods for carrying out the plan proposed here will be discussed by the next speaker.

Why then in this sense and with these limitations should we undertake a survey of all our institutions?

1. First of all because of the irresistible *power of facts*. As educators we profess to believe in the scientific method. Modern science has stood for the liberation of the human mind from the bondage of ignorance, tradition and superstition.

¹This and the following paper were presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of State Universities, November 13, 1920, in discussion of the topic: "A National Survey of State Universities."

tion. It has insisted upon an open-minded, frank, candid search for the truth regardless of the consequences to prejudices, preconceived notions and hypothetical explanations. It has insisted upon a careful painstaking collation of the facts. The same method and spirit should be utilized in advancing the standards of education itself.

One of our functions as university presidents is the formation of wise and far-seeing policies. Facts are absolutely essential to the successful performance of this duty. Moreover, our institutions are constantly subjected to criticism. We suffer repeatedly from rumors and assertions which affect seriously the usefulness and prestige of our institutions. Generalities of the most glittering and nebulous character are circulated persistently by foes and friends alike. The most effective method the university can adopt under these circumstances will be the clear presentation of cold, solid, unanswerable facts.

Furthermore, at regular intervals we are compelled to secure the financial support of our constituencies. We are inevitably brought into competition with crying needs in other highly important fields. We must concede that highways are essential to civilization. It is obvious that the various departments of the State Government must be maintained. Adequate provision must be made for the dependents of the State. Every public-minded citizen realizes that problems of conservation and development must be solved. Intelligence requires that State resources of all kinds must be fostered. The representatives of these interests show great skill in marshalling their arguments. They know their problems. Just so the fundamental facts in regard to our institutions are essential to our campaigns for funds. Legislators are not experts. They must trust our judgment. Frequently their decisions will rest upon the conviction that we know what we are talking about and have the facts at our finger tips. Our skill in answering objections will silence many potential critics.

Here then is one fundamental reason why the type of survey suggested is worthy of our careful consideration. It would provide those facts with which we can wisely formulate policies, effectively answer our critics and actually convince our constituents of the need of more liberal support.

2. In the second place, a national survey of state universities

is desirable, *because of the rapidity with which our problems are arising*. Those who have been in college administration for even a decade can look back with mingled feelings of regret and pleasure upon a period when problems were comparatively few, when conditions were stable, if not static, when salaries schedules were apparently adequate and when there was time to face administrative issues with caution and thoroughness. Today problems of the first magnitude jostle one another. They come and go so rapidly that there is scarcely time to make their acquaintance. Experience counts for little. No one has ever dealt with just the curious complex of serious entanglements which besets us. Our colleagues grasp frantically at every stray bit of wisdom or experience. Wireless stations are set up to catch any fleeting message of despair or encouragement. Questionnaires flit about with startling frequency and with staggering freight. Everyone is attempting to find some one who has done it, whatever "it" may be. The waste of time and energy in this process is appalling. Every one of us is trying to do everything as though we were the first one who ever thought of it.

In some way the experience of all of us in every problem of importance should be made easily available for this association. For example, consider the common problem of approaching legislatures. To be sure our individual situations have their local differences and difficulties but these campaigns are identical in their objective. We want money for higher education. It seems quite obvious that the initiative and resourcefulness of all of us in these matters could not fail to be of the utmost value to the cause of higher education. The necessity of strengthening every state university seems sometimes to escape our attention. When one member suffers we all suffer. When one member makes great gains we are all benefitted. Nothing stimulates Michigan like the information that Illinois or Wisconsin or California has forged ahead. The necessity of a national survey then arises out of the peculiar times upon which we have fallen. Serious difficulties arise over night. The timeliness of information which a national survey would provide must not be overlooked. Just now every one of us needs facts which are not available. It is an imposition continuously to flood our desks with series of questionnaires. We should arrange for a central office where the latest and most accurate information upon many of our

common problems would be quickly attainable. A little more cooperation with Dr. S. P. Capen, Director of the American Council on Education, and further utilization of the U. S. Bureau of Education, particularly through its specialist in Higher Education, Dr. George F. Zook, would make possible the results we have in mind.

3. In the third place, a national survey of state universities is desirable because of a *multiplicity of problems of the highest importance regarding which the data are not available*. Surely no generation of educators ever struggled with so many questions with such far reaching ramifications as those which have been assigned to us. I sometimes think that we are drifting rapidly toward confusion. Unless we manifest in the years just ahead a certain degree of comprehensive insight, if not statesmanship only chaos awaits us. We are far from any agreement upon educational aims and policies. Without attempting here to define the functions of a state university we may amply illustrate the magnitude of our present tasks by raising a few questions. How are we to answer the problem of economy of time in education? Does it require a regrouping of the entire educational system into new units? Do we not need a sharper demarcation of the fields of secondary and higher education? Do junior high schools, senior high schools and junior colleges show clearly the necessity for reorganization? How many units do we believe our American educational system should have? Would it be wise for our universities to eliminate junior college work? Should we advocate the organization of new units under state supervision, with state support and separate from our universities—units differentiated to meet the varying needs of different types of students?

Within the university itself questions of equal significance demand solution. Upon our combined knowledge of these problems, we could build a far more efficient system of higher education. Are we sure that our present units—schools and colleges—within the university are meeting the needs of America? Should we frankly and aggressively encourage the organization of new schools or colleges in Business or Commerce, Fine Arts (including Architecture), Journalism and Chemistry? Are we certain that the continued existence of our present units can be justified? Could all work in the general field of technology be coordinated under the adminis-

tration of one dean or are separate colleges of engineering, mines and chemistry to be fostered? In the light of modern tendencies, should medicine and dentistry be regarded as separate fields?

Another group of vital issues arises in regard to professional training. Should engineering be placed upon a purely professional basis? Should its status be changed from that of a college to that of a school and two years of liberal arts work be required for admission, just as in medicine and in law? In our schools of medicine shall we adopt the full-time plan for the clinical departments as well as for the laboratory sciences? In fact, are we at all clear in our policies regarding the entire problem of private practice by all of the professional staffs? There has been a curious failure to think clearly, courageously and honestly upon this issue.

The present status of research in American universities should occasion serious concern if not alarm. That research is thriving in private and industrial laboratories in our country is obvious. That our leading research workers are being attracted away from the universities is painfully apparent. That our university standards are dangerously involved in such tendencies no one will deny. What are we doing about it? Concerted action in this respect alone is vitally important to the standards of American civilization, for progress and prosperity wait upon discovery, investigation and invention.

Another phase of the research problem to which we must pay increasing attention is the relationship of our laboratories to the industries of the country. At the University of Michigan we have just established an Industrial Research Laboratory in cooperation with the Michigan Manufacturers' Association. I believe that this policy is sound and is capable of unlimited expansion. We have insisted upon all results of research being regarded as public property and subject always to publication. In a word, the question involved here is, How do we propose to foster research? How shall we compete successfully with private foundations and industrial enterprises?

Regarding the Faculty, we are confronted by at least two serious conditions. The salary situation is far from satisfactory. Every day brings new developments. All of our present statistics are valueless because they are out of date. Salary schedules have been thoroughly disorganized. There

seems to be general unanimity of opinion in regard to the wisdom of a normal minimum schedule but little agreement upon the actual details of the schedule. The facts as they exist this month and the proposals which are to be made for next year ought to be available for each institution. They would be extremely enlightening and potent in our efforts to secure increased support.

The supply of adequately trained university teachers is rapidly reaching the vanishing point. What do we propose to do about it? What are we doing? We may make raids upon the faculties of the smaller colleges, but what will they do? The quality of graduate students in leading American universities has seriously deteriorated. What motives are potent today in leading young men of real ability into university careers? Where does our duty lie in meeting this tremendously vital issue?

I have purposely avoided our financial difficulties because they are to be considered later today. Nevertheless the problem of rapid growth has ramifications other than financial. It effects all of our questions of organization and instruction as well as the matter of support. It suggests the necessity of grappling fundamentally with the entire subject of taxation. Perhaps no other single problem deserves more painstaking study than this one. Unless we can carry our campaign over into the field of the men who must find the revenues then our initiative and courage are defective. How are the various states proposing to meet the enormous increase in the cost of government? What solutions can our political economists propose? Is it possible for us to make an immediate attack upon this fundamental problem? Does it relate itself in any way to other sources of income? Could we possibly justify a policy of higher fees or tuition charges? Or would this do violence to our boasted ideals of free and equal opportunities for all?

Doubtless all will agree that the inner problems of education cannot be touched by surveys. The deeper things of the spirit are unseen. We cannot touch them or tabulate them. "The wind bloweth where it will, and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh and whither it goeth." Nevertheless, the answering of our pressing administrative problems will set us free to do our real work as educators.

The essential irresistible force of facts, the whirling and bewildering rapidity of educational changes and developments and the challenging multiplicity of problems of the first magnitude, counsel us in no easy or soft tones, to unite our forces and over against our common tasks to set the strength and wisdom of our common experience.

If we do not do it for ourselves and do it speedily, we may confidently anticipate that it will be done for us. Our institutions have become so large, their demands are apparently so huge, and their influence so potent in American life, that they cannot escape attention for long. It is our solemn responsibility to be thoroughly aware of the situation and to base our policies and recommendations upon accurate and comparable data gathered from all of the institutions constituting this organization.

M. L. BURTON.

A National Survey of State Universities—How Should It be Undertaken?¹

BY way of introduction it may be appropriate to offer a few generalizations about university surveys. A thoroughly satisfactory survey has never been made. I am not now speaking of the satisfaction, or lack of it, experienced by the officers of the institutions surveyed. By a satisfactory survey I mean one which is satisfactory from the scientific and educational point of view; one which represents a complete inventory of the university in its varied relationships, and which offers a sane and stimulating program for future development. There has been none such. Some surveys have been wrong-headed to a degree. Most surveys have been badly organized both as to the job and as to the final report. All surveys have been fragmentary and incomplete. This last assertion deserves some elaboration.

The field in which the surveyor has chiefly basked is the field of administration. He has hunted up the things that can be counted and measured. He has counted them in new ways. He has checked one unheard-of thing against another and thereby produced surprising revelations. Much tumult and debate have resulted from his activities, but generally much profitable reform also.

Especially has the surveyor disported himself in the high realm of university policy. Policies cannot be weighed and measured, to be sure. But they are concrete and tangible, and after having been put to the extreme question they make excellent material for an auto-da-fe. Moreover, policies have always been largely matters of opinion. It is presumed that they are based on such facts as administrative officers have had in hand. But if the surveyor discovers new facts of significance, his opinion on policies may properly command an equal measure of respect. And policies are interesting. They interest the public and they interest the investigator. A survey which passed off without a discussion of policies would be

¹Address delivered before the National Association of State Universities, November 13, 1920.

regarded both by its instigators and by its perpetrators as flat, stale and unprofitable.

Among the most fruitful activities of surveyors have been the efforts to take account of the social and economic setting of the institutions studied. A university does not float in a vacuum. It is conditioned by the community which it serves. The courses which it offers are, or should be, adjusted to the physical environment, the character of the population, the industries and the professions of the community. The brief social surveys which have formed a part of the later investigations of higher institutions are in many respects the most valuable contributions thus far made by surveyors. Yet all these social surveys have been superficial. Some, I suspect, have been misleading.

Thus far university surveys have either dodged wholly the question of the efficacy of the educational process (the thing for which universities are primarily established) or else they have blundered egregiously in attempting to estimate it. By tacit consent this matter has been lately ignored in investigations of institutions made by outsiders, except as light may be thrown upon it by the collection and interpretation of purely mechanical data. Apparently the thoroughgoing examination of the quality of instruction and the educational results actually attained must for some time to come be the work of insiders. Self-surveys have recently been much advocated. I believe in them heartily and hope they may be encouraged. If undertaken with care and in the right spirit they should be the means of effecting important economies and improvements. It may be pointed out, however, that self-surveys almost inevitably break down when the larger field of university policy is considered. It appears to be well-nigh impossible for the officers of an institution, no matter how scientifically-minded they may be, to divest themselves of partisanship in determining the relation of their own institutions to others.

The possible ramifications of any survey are almost infinite. Every one has raised more questions than it has attempted to answer. Hence the incompleteness and fragmentary character of them. I believe we must recognize that they are bound to be fragmentary. Indeed, the wrong word has probably been used to designate these undertakings. They ought not to be called surveys at all. They are investi-

gations, investigations of this or that phase of university activity, investigations which with plenty of time and plenty of money and plenty of wisdom might be extended to cover all that a university does and is, but which are not likely to be so extended. And an investigation—or a survey, if you will—strictly limited in scope, designed to furnish the answer to two or three specific questions may be very useful.

These observations bear directly on the subject I have been asked to discuss. Public higher education has progressed to the point where it is imperative that the maladjustment of educational facilities to regional and national requirements be remedied, that the function and spread of state higher institutions and their relationships to other educational agencies be redefined, and that a unified and consistent national policy for the development of higher education be outlined which will commend itself to the institutions concerned. A series of studies genuinely national in scope must underly these determinations. For example, there must be investigations of the actual and potential resources of the states and of the nation that may be utilized for educational purposes; there must be estimates of the educational needs of given areas and communities much more careful and complete than any that have yet been attempted; there must be studies of the actual content and results of certain kinds of professional training, studies of the various experiments in reorganizing the administrative units of the educational system. The composite total if properly brought together and interpreted might pass for a national survey of state universities. But it would be more than that. It ought not to be undertaken unless more is contemplated. The separated land grant colleges and teacher training agencies are parts of the higher educational systems of all states and must be considered along with the state universities in determining state or national policies in the field of higher education.

Granting that such a survey is desirable, who can make it? It would cost in the neighborhood of half a million dollars and would occupy the time of a staff of experienced men for several years. For reasons which it is unnecessary to discuss, this undertaking is impossible for one of the great foundations. All groups of state institutions might make a joint appeal to Congress for a special appropriation to the Bureau of Education specifically for this task. But if the appeal were

made I have small hope that it would be successful at the present time. Personally I think that the need for studies of this sort is the strongest argument for the creation of a Federal Department of Education. I am not a supporter of the Smith-Towner Bill, because that measure fails to provide adequately for the most useful function of a Department of Education, namely, the investigation of questions of large national importance, and because I do not believe in large federal subsidies on the 50-50 basis. But a Department of Education devoted primarily to the task of investigation and properly equipped would be the agency to undertake a genuine national survey of public higher education. Unfortunately, we are not likely to have such Department in the near future.

In default of the kind of comprehensive survey, which I take to be indicated in the topic assigned me and which is manifestly beyond the reach of any existing agency, it is not necessary to turn our backs on the whole proposition. Partial surveys can be carried on with the machinery now at hand. I will venture to call your attention to three problems which I have already mentioned and which have a direct relation to the immediate future development of state public institutions. They are: the problem of public support, the problem of economy of management, and the problem of the distribution of higher educational facilities. All should be studied from the national point of view. Partial investigations bearing on all three could be undertaken through the cooperation of the various institutions and the bodies representing them. I will try to show how.

1. It is probably clear to every administrator that state institutions are reaching the limit of support from public funds under prevailing conditions of valuation and taxation of property. In some states the university and the land grant college have been systematically starved for years because the revenue systems of these states do not yield enough to maintain them. Even in the wealthiest states and those possessed of the most enlightened fiscal systems there is growing anxiety as to how the means can be secured to meet the increasing burden of education, and especially higher education. The public higher institutions of the country never before faced a threat so dangerous. We have come to the day when the question must be answered—can states afford free higher education? Facts are already at hand to prove that they cannot

afford it unless all property within the borders of the state can be brought to pay its just tithe for public purposes. The future of state higher institutions is intimately bound up with the development of state taxation. Their very lives are at stake. The propaganda of the past two years on behalf of more liberal support of education has been based on the assumption that money could be had from the ordinary sources if public sentiment were aroused. The assumption is evidently incorrect. The propagandists, particularly those active in the cause of higher education, have not addressed themselves to the right issue.

Since the staffs of state higher institutions generally contain the leading local experts on economics and government, it seems obvious that the obligation rests upon state institutions to enlighten the public as to this emergency and to suggest practical remedies. I believe a careful study should be made in every state of the state's wealth, its system of taxation, its method of distributing monies for educational and other purposes. I realize that the making of such studies may be classed among the extra hazardous occupations. Large property interests will not scruple to interfere and their tactics will not always be gentle. Nevertheless, the universities are better equipped for this service than any other agencies. If they do not undertake it, no one else is likely to.

Specifically then, I propose that this Association appoint a committee to consider the investigation by officers of the state supported institutions in each state of the existing systems of state taxation. The Association should request the Association of Land Grant Colleges to appoint a similar committee, because in this matter the interests of state universities and land grant colleges where these institutions are separated, are identical. But this Association may properly take the initiative, since the departments of economics and government in separated land grant colleges are generally service departments and hence not so strongly developed. The joint committee's task would be, after general outline of the field, to suggest to the appropriate institution of each state the kind of studies which might be made by their professors and advanced students. The joint committee would in the end bring together and interpret the results.

2. The financial emergency now transcends all other problems. All state universities need more money than they are

likely to get in the immediate future. As has been suggested, the potential supply is sharply limited by existing systems of taxation. This fact, coupled with the enormously increased demands made by university boards on public appropriating bodies, has led these bodies to insist upon the utmost economy in the expenditure of sums granted. I suspect there is a very general belief that universities are wastefully run. One encounters expressions of this belief everywhere. The situation is not as bad as the lay critics think it is, but we must all admit that there is some measure of justification for the wide-spread conviction that part of the public money devoted to educational purposes goes to waste. It is clear that the existence of this conviction cannot safely be ignored. University officers should be prepared to demonstrate that the funds entrusted to them are used to the utmost advantage. This was always important. It is especially important now.

I have happened to investigate the unit costs in several state institutions. This is not the place to indicate details, but those investigations revealed that it was possible for the institutions under consideration to effect very substantial savings by a more scientific distribution of the teaching load, more systematic use of building space, better classification of expenditures and a more business-like method of cost accounting in general. In the last few years a number of institutions have made still more searching analyses of the costs of every university function which abundantly prove the feasibility of large economies without diminishing the efficiency of either teaching or research. President Hughes' admirable studies in this field led the way. They are familiar to you all. One of the most recent contributors is Mr. Stevens of the University of Washington. In the last number of the *Educational Review* he makes a plea for a thorough-going system of cost accounting. He shows by a graphic presentation of the system in force in the state of Washington how completely educational expenditures may be controlled by this means and he urges the adoption by state institutions of a uniform plan for reporting and analyzing all expenditures.

State universities could hardly do anything more likely to commend them to their supporters in the present crisis than to follow Mr. Stevens' suggestion. As my second concrete proposition, therefore, I should like to recommend that this Association appoint a committee to bring about the adoption by

state higher institutions of a uniform system of cost accounting. If this recommendation meets with your approval, I would suggest that the committee take cognizance of the recent action of the Committee on College Organization and Policy of the Association of Land Grant Colleges. That Committee has requested the United States Bureau of Education to make an intensive internal investigation of some 10 or 12 land grant institutions with a view to reporting upon their educational and financial policies. Should your association see fit to appoint a committee to consider the unification of systems of cost accounting, it should, I believe, seek the cooperation of this Committee of the Association of Land Grant Colleges.

3. The student of higher education cannot fail to be impressed by the rapidity with which state institutions have outgrown their early parochialism. Thirty or forty years ago the majority of state institutions were state institutions only in the sense that the state supported them. It was difficult to make the citizens of the state feel that the universities and state colleges belonged to them. Conversely there was a tendency on the part of the officers and alumni of many state institutions to regard their institutions as especially devoted to the interests of a section or of a particular group within the state. Nothing else can account for the haphazard location of universities, land grant colleges, and normal schools. Nothing else, unless it be a conviction of the total depravity of the human race, can account for the development within the boundaries of a single sparsely populated commonwealth of two or more competing institutions maintained by public funds. In fact it was only gradually that the circles of influence and of service of these institutions expanded until they cut across one another. During the past two decades we have seen the development in many states of the sharpest kind of conflict between duplicating and competing state institutions. Various devices have been tried to bring about harmony, or at least an armed truce. Joint boards of control have been created; legislatures have arbitrarily delimited the fields of the several institutions; outside advisors have been brought in at considerable expense to suggest possible solutions. The phenomena are different in different states. They need not be discussed here. But it is worth noting that they indicate the growth of the concept that state supported higher education is

in its essence a single enterprise and that the policies and offerings of any state higher institution are of concern to all citizens of the state. In other words, these publicly supported universities and colleges have lately become state institutions in fact. Every state which has divided its higher educational effort is finally alive to the serious import, economic and social, of the problem of duplication.

And now the spheres of influence of state institutions are spreading further still. They overrun the boundaries of the states in which the institutions are located. Some state institutions are already national in appeal and national in service. Others have a regional constituency which embraces several states. The problem of duplication in the field of public higher education has ceased to be exclusively a state problem. The nation is at length concerned—although it may not know it yet—in the duplication in adjoining states of expensive educational facilities for which there is slight demand.

Reproduce in your mind's eye the educational map of the United States, with state boundaries for the moment obliterated. It is apparent that higher educational establishments are very unequally and very illogically distributed. The state institutions of neighboring states in many cases lie within a few hours' run of one another. There is a large surplusage of schools and departments devoted to certain kinds of professional training, for example, forestry and mining engineering. There is an equally serious shortage of facilities for training in other professions such as veterinary medicine, or the applications of engineering science to industrial organization and management. An imitative tendency has also been apparent in the development of state higher institutions. Whenever one university establishes a new professional division, others are prone to follow suit if they can. The composite result, if one looks at the United States as a whole, is a striking lack of correlation between the educational needs of the country and the locations and offerings of the higher schools.

I submit that at a time when there is much doubt about the ability of the public to continue to support free higher education, these conditions demand remedy. The domain of higher education has now become so broad that no institution, no matter how wealthy, can occupy it all. No university can any longer be universal. Every university must to a certain degree specialize. Its offerings must be adjusted to the needs of its

constituents. As the field of knowledge continues to expand and professional specialties continue to multiply, certain universities will be forced to provide new lines of training as yet unforeseen. If they are to serve their constituencies adequately with the money available, they must likewise be prepared to drop those divisions or departments, the maintenance of which cannot be justified on the ground of educational necessity.

These considerations suggest that the public higher institutions should study the national aspects of the enterprise in which they are engaged. My third and final recommendation to this body is, therefore, that it participate in a kind of preliminary or superficial survey of the distribution of opportunities for advanced and professional training at higher institutions throughout the country. Obviously other groups of institutions would be as much interested in such a survey as the members of this Association, for example, the Association of Land Grant Colleges, the Association of Teachers' Colleges, and the Association of Normal Schools and perhaps the Association of Medical Colleges and the Association of Law Schools. You are probably aware that all of these Associations except one are represented in the American Council on Education. The principal object for which the Council was founded was "to promote and carry out cooperative action in matters of common interest to the associations represented." Consequently I would suggest, if this proposition meets with your approval, that the National Association of State Universities petition the American Council on Education in terms somewhat as follows:

That the Council appoint a joint committee composed of representatives of the National Association of State Universities, the Association of Land Grant Colleges, the Association of Teachers' Colleges and such other groups of professional institutions as seem to be concerned, to undertake a preliminary survey of the distribution of facilities for professional training and graduate study in public and private institutions in the United States and that the Council be requested to ask the cooperation of the United States Bureau of Education in prosecuting the study.

SAMUEL P. CAPEN.

A Visit to the American University Union in Europe

AS I was the first Director of the London Branch of the American University Union in Europe, my visit on behalf of the Board of Trustees last summer was not calculated to produce surprises, but things have changed so much since my year of office in 1918-19 that the experience of 1920 seemed almost entirely new. To begin with, the office was not in the same place, having been moved from the hospitable quarters of the Farmers' Loan & Trust Company near Trafalgar Square to the more academic region of Russell Square, between the British Museum and University College. The change in habitat was accompanied by a change in clientele, for, while in 1918 we had young American soldiers on their way to the war or back in England on leave—it might be on their way home again—in 1920 the callers were undergraduates or professors interested mainly in university matters. The task of adjusting undergraduate or graduate students from American colleges and universities to the English system or English students to the American system is by no means an easy one; it requires skill and tact and a more familiar knowledge both of American and of British higher educational systems than the ordinary professor, to say nothing of the student, usually possesses. No American can be blamed for not understanding the complex variety of the British higher educational system, which has developed idiosyncracies at its own sweet will, almost entirely free from control on the part of the central government. The same is true of the American colleges and universities, which were indeed founded in the first instance on the English model, but have since developed differences and characteristics of their own. The average English professor knows even less about "units" than the average American professor does about the differences between a Pass and Honours degree. The American Council on Education through its Committee on International Educational Relations has now in hand a scheme for the adjusting of equivalents, but even with the adoption of the general principles it hopes to suggest, there will still be on both sides a great many ad-

justments to make which can only be accomplished with the help of some one familiar by long experience in both systems. Any extensive familiarity with both systems is somewhat rare, and the Union is particularly fortunate in having as Director of the British Division, Dr. G. E. MacLean, who has held important positions in American universities and has come into close contact with the leading British institutions in the course of a residence in the British Isles now extending for some years.

Not that I found the atmosphere of the London office altogether academic, or if it was academic, it was academic on the more business like and vital side, closely in contact with actual life. There were three boys who were trying to work their way to the Olympic Games at Antwerp, and had been held up by the illness of one of their number, which speedily exhausted the financial resources of the whole party. They were put in the way of earning some money, for they did not want any other form of assistance, and they were advised to get home again as quickly as possible.

There were numerous applications from young men and young women, undergraduates and graduates of American colleges, who wished to go to college, in England, mainly at Oxford, and the Oxford colleges, both for men and for women, were overwhelmed by English applicants. Most of them, however, generously consented to receive one or two American students, but the difficulty was to choose, a difficulty which was complicated in one instance by the enterprise of an American girl, who applied for admission to two Oxford colleges and was accepted for both. These obstacles were very quickly overcome by centralizing everything in the Union office, and a generous number of American students (considering the pressure on the English colleges) were placed in Oxford, in Cambridge and in London. Arrangements were also made by Dr. MacLean for the placing of a few English students in American colleges and universities.

The services of the London office of the Union were also enlisted for the selection of American professors for service at English universities and vice versa. Naturally these arrangements are ultimately made between the professor selected and the appointing university, but before matters reach this culminating point there are necessary enquiries as to availability and suitability, which can only be answered by someone familiar,

as Dr. MacLean is, with the universities of the United States and with those of the United Kingdom.

Then there was help to be given for movements in international education which could hardly be anticipated, for the course of foreign exchange in educational matters does not always run smooth. There was a Russian professor on his way to fulfill an engagement with a middle western university who was detained in England by the fact that he had merely a passport from the representative of the Kerensky Government, which the United States authorities could not regard as still in existence. If he had been able to obtain a passport from the Bolshevik Government, it is hardly likely that the representatives of the United States Government would have been any more pleased with it, and what way out of the difficulty was eventually found I do not know, for the case was still pending when I left London, after taking charge of the office for a short two weeks to enable Dr. MacLean to take a richly deserved holiday. Some way, however, was found and the Russian professor was enabled to proceed to his destination.

American professors on their way to the newly organized countries of Central Europe had no such serious difficulties, but they needed advice, first, where to go, and secondly, how to get there. There was a grand Athletic Festival at Prague, which made the overstrained hotel accommodation of that city impossible for a season, and intending visitors had to be warned to keep away until it was over. The ancient university in the Czecho-Slovakian capital was, nevertheless, magnetic to enterprising American investigators, and more than one arrived there with the help of the Union before the end of the summer.

Before I took up the temporary directorship of the British Division, I was in and out of the office daily, as it was the headquarters for the American professors attending the conference of professors of English of the British Empire and the United States, of which I was a member. Indeed, one does not see how, without the help of the London office of the Union, the conference could have been so efficiently arranged and successfully carried out. The London colleges are scattered, and it was necessary to hold meetings at three or four of them. This proved not a little confusing to the American professor unfamiliar with the complex organization of the University of London and the whereabouts of its principal col-

leges, and without the office at 50 Russell Square to turn to in case of doubt or difficulty, it is to be feared that some of the American delegates would have been, if not irretrievably lost, at any rate lost long enough to fail to arrive at the places appointed until after the meetings were over. As it was, we usually met at the Union offices for our letters, and made our way in a body to the particular college at which the morning session was held; so far as I am aware, no American delegate suffered the humiliation of being "lost in London." If, as is hoped, the second conference of professors of English is held at Columbia University in 1922, possibly the office of the Secretary of the Union at 201 Journalism Building will prove similarly useful as a directing center for the sometimes bewildering complexity of the Columbia buildings and arrangements.

At the Paris office, although I had never enjoyed any official position there, I was by no means a stranger, for I had spent a month at the Royal Palace Hotel in the height of its war activities, when it was full of American soldier boys going to the front or just back from it; but here again I found the scene completely changed between 1918 and 1920. The change, indeed, was even more striking than in the London office, though the familiar faces of Professor Vibbert, the Director, Dr. Krans, the Secretary, and Mlle. Messy, the Assistant Secretary, supplied a very welcome link with the past. Everything else seemed changed, and I marvelled once more at the enterprise and hard work which had succeeded in equipping a new and smoothly running organization and firmly establishing it on a peace basis. The new offices are delightfully situated near the Luxembourg Garden and are admirably adapted to the peaceful activities of the Continental Division. Every day there was a group of students working in the small but commodious library, and enquiries from American and French visitors were incessant. The work done is very similar in character to that already described in connection with the London office—the selection of French candidates for scholarships and appointments, temporary or permanent, in American universities, and the advice and direction of American professors and students about to teach or to study in French universities. The greater concentration of American students in Paris in comparison with London gives the Paris office a better opportunity for looking after the social needs of

American students in Paris than is possible in the English capital. I happened to drop in for a small dance arranged in connection with the Society for French Homes, a sauterie as it is called, and it was a very joyous and successful affair for both the French and the American young people who took part in it.

It cannot be repeated too often that the aim of the Union in France is not to segregate American students but exactly the contrary, to bring them into wholesome contact with the best elements of French social and intellectual life in a way that could not be accomplished without some such organization as the Union provides. In the old days, the ordinary American student had a pretty lonely time of it if he were restricted to the social opportunities provided by his pension or restaurant and the classes which he happened to attend, and if he sought for other opportunities on his own initiative, it was likely enough that those he would come into easy contact with would not be companions of the most desirable kind. It is precisely this lack of social opportunity and of contact with French life under the conditions in which French people are seen at their best that the Society of French Homes has been founded to supply, and the Union is greatly indebted to the French ladies who have been to so much trouble to make this part of the Union organization effective and successful. It is an office that requires tact as well as zeal and energy, and the skill and devotion with which it has been carried out at the Paris office are beyond praise.

Intellectual opportunities are easier to arrange, but here, too, the aim of the Continental Division is to bring American students into close contact with French intellectual life—not to encourage them to form a group by themselves, as they are very likely to be driven to do from sheer loneliness if they are left to their own resources. The Maison des Etudiants, for which a site has been offered by the municipality of Paris, will be a tremendous asset in this respect, if we can obtain the \$300,000 for the building and the \$300,000 for the endowment of the Union, which the Finance Committee of the Trustees is now making a determined effort to raise. The University of Paris in the old days no doubt provided the model on which the English college system was founded, but that was long ago, and the French University system is from the American point of view somewhat lacking on the social side.

This appears, to a friendly observer, to be true of the student who comes up from the provinces to study at Paris, and it is necessarily more so of the student who comes from a foreign country without introductions and with language difficulties and differences in social usage to get over. The Maison, when it is erected, will prove a natural and inevitable meeting ground between French and American students, between French and American professors, between French professors and American students, and between American professors and French students. There are not only to be lectures especially planned to promote international understanding and sympathy, but there will be informal gatherings at which the same end will be more effectively attained.

Another important part of the machinery of this interchange will, I hope, be a good working library, specializing in American History and the working of American institutions. The American Library Association is now conducting a very praiseworthy effort to meet this obvious need, and is bearing with a great deal of courage the financial burden imposed upon it by this serious addition to its responsibilities. The Union regards the enterprise of the American Library Association with the keenest sympathy, and Dr. Krans, the devoted Secretary of the Continental Division of the Union is doing all he can to help in its efficient working. I am expressing a personal rather than an official opinion, (though I imagine my colleagues on the Board of Trustees are in complete agreement with me on this issue) when I venture to put on record the hope and belief that in the Maison des Etudiants there will be room for such a library as I have just described. The site offered by the City of Paris on the Rue du Four, just near the Boulevard St. Germain, is admirably adapted as a center, not only for the social and intellectual activities of the Union, but for a well-equipped working library, for which the present premises at 1 Rue de Fleurus, charming but limited, do not offer sufficient accommodation. I am sure that the present Director of the Continental Division, Professor E. B. Babcock, and his associate, Dr. Krans, are heartily in sympathy with this view, and that nothing would please them better than to see the American library in Paris and the various activities of the Union generously provided for under the roof of the Maison des Etudiants.

J. W. CUNLIFFE.

American Council on Education

The Referendum on Federal Legislation

EARLY in 1920 the Executive Committee of the Council authorized the Director to conduct a referendum on important Federal legislation. The questions to be submitted on the referendum ballot were discussed at the annual meeting of the Council on May 7 and 8, 1920. Shortly after that date the ballot was issued together with a brief explanatory pamphlet giving the arguments for and against each of the questions asked. Because the academic year was just closing the referendum could not be brought to the attention of the university senates, college faculties and governing boards of associations before autumn. Since the reopening of the higher institutions, however, returns have come in steadily. Most of the faculty groups have studied the questions presented with great care. In many cases special committees have been appointed to make further investigation and report for the benefit of their respective faculties before the vote was taken. The local branches of the American Association of University Professors have also given the referendum ballot especial attention. The results represent a body of mature opinion that should be valuable in determining the action finally to be taken by Congress. Inasmuch as there is slight prospect of radical legislation bearing on education during the present session, it is thought best to postpone the summarization of the returns until they are as nearly complete as possible. The Council's office has up to date received the votes of fifty-seven universities, colleges and associations.

The Franco-American Exchange of Fellowships and Scholarships

The committee which has charge of the administration of the Franco-American scholarship exchanges selected American candidates for French scholarships and French candidates for American scholarships during the summer months of 1920. The records of American applicants for French scholarships and fellowships were reviewed by two sub-committees. The committee charged with recommending women candidates was composed of Professor Margaret E. Maltby, Miss Vir-

ginia Newcomb, Miss Mary M. Finn and Monsieur J. J. Champenois. The members of the committee reviewing the records of the male candidates were: Dr. I. L. Kandel, Monsieur J. J. Champenois, Professor G. H. Nettleton, Dr. John Erskine and Dr. R. L. Kelly. Twenty-four American girls were selected for scholarships and fellowships in Lycées and Écoles Normales. The announcement of the offer by the French Government of sixteen graduate scholarships and fellowships at the University of Bordeaux and the University of Toulouse came so late in the academic year that it was impossible to select the full complement of candidates. Only one of these scholarships was filled.

A committee composed of Miss Virginia Newcomb, Miss Mary M. Finn and Miss Jessica B. Peixotto was sent to France by the Council to assist in the selection of French girls for scholarships offered by American universities and colleges. The committee interviewed eighty-three candidates and selected thirty-four scholars, who were subsequently distributed among thirty-one American higher institutions. In addition to these girls, forty-two were granted scholarships for a second year by the institutions which they attended during the last academic year. There are also five men holding scholarships at American universities under the jurisdiction of the Council's Committee on Franco-American Exchange of Scholarships and Fellowships.

The committee at a meeting held December 6, 1920, made plans for the continuance of this enterprise during the academic year 1921-22. The Council's office was instructed by the Committee to use its best efforts to secure scholarships for French students, both men and women, for advanced study or for study of special professional subjects that have been conspicuously developed in the United States.

Additions to the Council's Membership Lists

In the Educational Record, Volume 1, No. 4, the representatives of the constituent associations of the American Council on Education, together with the newly elected officers of the Council for 1920-21 were listed. Since that time another national association, the American Association of Teachers Colleges, has been added to the Council as a constituent member. The official representatives of this association and the present associate and institutional membership lists are given below:

NEW CONSTITUENT MEMBER

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS COLLEGES:

President John R. Kirk, State Teachers' College, Kirksville, Mo.
Dean H. C. Minnich, Teachers' College of Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.
President J. G. Crabbe, Colorado State Teachers' College, Greeley, Colo.

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

1. ALUMNI ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RHODES SCHOLARS:

Secretary, Mr. Frank Aydelotte, Mass. Inst. of Tech., Cambridge, Mass.

2. AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE:

Secretary, Mr. Burton E. Livingston, Smithsonian Inst., Washington, D. C.

3. AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION:

Secretary, Dr. Waldo G. Leland, Woodward Bldg., Washington, D. C.

4. THE AMERICAN SCANDINAVIAN FOUNDATION:

Secretary, Mr. Henry G. Leach, 25 West 45th Street, New York City.

5. ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE SCHOOLS OF ARCHITECTURE:

Secretary, Professor C. A. Martin, Ithaca, N. Y.

6. RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION:

Secretary, Dr. H. D. Cope, 1032 East 55th Street, Chicago, Ill.

7. NATIONAL INSTITUTION FOR MORAL INSTRUCTION:

Mr. Milton Fairchild, 3770 McKinley Street, Washington, D. C.

8. NATIONAL CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS:

Secretary, Dean F. W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

9. MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA:

Secretary, Professor Carleton Brown, 1199 Raymond Avenue, St. Paul, Minn.

10. AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE REGISTRARS:

Secretary, Mr. Raymond Walter, Lehigh University, South Bethlehem, Pa.

11. NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL:

Secretary, Dr. Vernon Kellogg, 1701 Mass. Ave., Washington, D. C.

12. SOCIETY OF COLLEGE TEACHERS OF EDUCATION:

Secretary, Miss Florence E. Bamberger, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

ALABAMA:

Alabama Polytechnic Institute

CALIFORNIA:

California Institute of Technology

Leland Stanford Junior University

Mills College

Occidental College

Pomona College

University of California

University of Southern California

COLORADO:

Colorado College

Colorado State Teachers' College

University of Colorado

CONNECTICUT:

Connecticut College

Wesleyan University

Yale University

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:

Catholic University of America

GEORGIA:

Brenau College

ILLINOIS:

De Paul University

Eureka College

James Millikin University

Knox College

Northwestern University

Rockford College

University of Chicago

University of Illinois

Y. M. C. A. College of Chicago

INDIANA:

Butler College

DePauw University

Rose Polytechnic Institute

University of Notre Dame

IOWA:

Cornell College

Grinnell College

Iowa State Teachers College

Luther College

Union College of Iowa

Upper Iowa University

KANSAS:

Baker University

Washburn College

KENTUCKY:

Center College

Georgetown College

University of Kentucky

MAINE:

Bowdoin College

MARYLAND:

Goucher College

Johns Hopkins University

Maryland College for Women

University of Maryland

MASSACHUSETTS:

Boston University

Harvard University

Mount Holyoke College

Radcliffe College

Smith College

Tufts College

Wellesley College

Wheaton College

MICHIGAN:

Albion College

Alma College

Kalamazoo College

University of Michigan

MINNESOTA:
Carleton College
College of St. Catherine
College of St. Olaf
College of St. Teresa
College of St. Thomas
Hamline University
Macalester College
University of Minnesota

MISSOURI:
Kirksville State Teachers' College
Southeast Missouri State Teachers' College

MONTANA:
University of Montana

NEW HAMPSHIRE:
Dartmouth College

NEW JERSEY:
College of St. Elizabeth

NEW YORK:
Alfred University
Colgate University
Columbia University
Hamilton College
New York University
University of Rochester
Wells College

NORTH CAROLINA:
Elon College
St. Genevieve's College
University of North Carolina

OHIO:
Case School of Applied Science
Defiance College
Denison University
Lake Erie College
Marietta College
Miami University
Municipal University of Akron
Muskingum College
Oberlin College
Ohio State University

OREGON:
University of Oregon

PENNSYLVANIA:
Allegheny College
Bryn Mawr College
Carnegie Institute of Technology
Drexel Institute
Dropsie College
Grove City College
Haverford College
Lafayette College
Lehigh University
Temple University
University of Pennsylvania
University of Pittsburgh

SOUTH CAROLINA:
Winthrop Normal and Industrial College

SOUTH DAKOTA:
Huron College
University of South Dakota

TEXAS:
College of Industrial Arts
University of Texas.

VERMONT:
University of Vermont

VIRGINIA:
Sweet Briar College
University of Virginia

WISCONSIN:
Beloit College
Campion College
Lawrence College
Marquette University
Milwaukee-Downer College
Ripon College
St. Clara College

Educational Research

The Directors of The Commonwealth Fund having become convinced of the importance of encouraging educational research, requested a group of leading educational men of the country to report upon the opportunities in the field and recommend a plan of operation.

This Educational Research Conference was held in Atlantic City on October 23, 24, and 25, 1920. The members attending the Conference were:

A. Ross Hill, President, University of Missouri, Chairman; Lotus D. Coffman, President, University of Minnesota; Charles H. Judd, Director, School of Education, University of Chicago; Paul Monroe, Director, School of Education, Teachers' College, Columbia University; Leonard P. Ayres, Director, Division of Education, Russell Sage Foundation; Samuel P. Capen, Director, American Council on Education; Paul H. Hanus, Professor of Education, Harvard University; Max Farrand, General Director of The Commonwealth Fund.

A gratifying feature of the Conference was that the members were able to agree so readily, not merely upon the large divisions of the field, which were fairly obvious, but also in selecting some of the most desirable problems to be investigated within each division.

The Conference, therefore, made its report choosing for its main subjects; the problem of school revenues; the evaluation, analysis, measures and standards of accomplishment of school subjects; the field of supervision; and the reorganization of public school systems. In each one of those larger divisions the Conference chose a particular subject by way of illustration, suggesting how and by whom the study of that particular subject might be advisedly undertaken.

For the carrying on of this research, the Conference recommended the appointment of a Committee to consider and recommend projects for research, and to assume executive responsibility for supervising the carrying on of such researches as might be adopted, and it was deemed advisable that this Committee might also recommend researches to be undertaken by individuals or associations.

The Directors of The Commonwealth Fund accepted this report, and appointed the following Committee:

Leonard P. Ayres, Vice-President, Cleveland Trust Company; Samuel P. Capen, Director, American Council on Education, *Secretary*; Lotus D. Coffman, President, University of Minnesota; Ellwood P. Cubberley, Professor, Stanford University; Charles H. Judd, Director, School of Education, University of Chicago; Paul Monroe, Director, School of Education, Teachers' College, Columbia University; Frank E. Spaulding, Professor, Yale University; Max Farrand, General Director, The Commonwealth Fund, *Chairman, ex officio*.

The Educational Record

Published Quarterly By

The American Council on Education

Volume 2

April, 1921

No. 2

Editor :

SAMUEL PAUL CAPEN

CONTENTS

The Referendum on the Federal Department of Education

By the Editor

The Smith-Towner Bill Reported by the House Committee on
Education

British Academic Credentials

By a Committee

The Junior College Movement

Report of National Conference Committee on Standards

The Dante Sex-Centenary

Report of the Auditor

Annual Subscription \$2.00

COPYRIGHT, 1921
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

The Referendum on a Federal Department of Education

THE Committee on Federal Legislation of the American Council on Education submitted at the last annual meeting of the Council the draft of a referendum ballot designed to ascertain the opinions of the members of the Council on several important matters embodied in pending federal legislation. The ballot was approved by the Council. On May 19, 1920, copies of it were issued, together with a pamphlet containing a digest of the arguments for and against each of the propositions on which a vote was requested.

The ballot was sent to the president of each institutional member of the Council and to the secretary of each of the associations that form the constituent membership. Large institutions were requested to submit the ballot to their academic senates or councils. Small institutions having no senate or similar segregated group were requested to submit the ballot to the teaching staff as a whole. The constituent associations were asked to record the votes of their respective executive committees.

As the ballot was submitted late in the academic year, it did not prove possible for many institutions to vote on the propositions before the summer. Accordingly the ballot was issued a second time on November 15, 1920. Altogether returns have been received from about half of the members of the Council. These returns reflect the opinions of the officers of a wide variety of institutions and associations. They are summarized and interpreted below.

Seventy ballots and seven separate resolutions were received from the Council's membership. The ballot contained the request that institutions and executive committees of associations should report the number of persons voting "yes" and "no" on each of the questions. These instructions were not followed in all cases. Fifty ballots were received on which the vote was recorded in the manner requested. Twenty ballots contained merely records of "yes" and "no" votes, without giving the number of persons voting affirmatively or negatively. It is, therefore, necessary to summarize the two kinds of returns separately. The

Vote of Institutions.

	46 ballots with numerical record of votes		17 ballots with "yes" or "no" votes	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Is the creation of a department of education with a secretary in the President's cabinet endorsed?.....	729	291	12	5
2. Is the principle of Federal aid to education in the States on condition that the States match the Federal appropriation endorsed?.....	553	429	11	5
3. Should a department of education supervise the expenditures of Federal appropriations in the States?.....	415	531	8	8
4. Should a department of education be authorized to determine acceptable standards, to inspect institutions within the States and to publish its findings?.....	539	433	10	5
5. Is the Smith-Towner bill endorsed without amendments?.....	112	716	5	11
6. Is an amendment of the Smith-Towner bill to provide for the inclusion of the Federal Board for Vocational Education in the department of education favored?.....	580	272	11	4
7. Is an amendment of the Smith-Towner bill to eliminate the proposed appropriations for cooperation with the States and to provide for an investigation and report by the Department of Education on the distribution of Federal aid and the amounts needed for specific purposes favored?.....	348	440	5	9
8. Is an amendment to the Smith-Towner bill to provide for the appointment by the Department of Education of an advisory council favored?.....	469	318	13	1
9. Is the Kenyon bill endorsed?.....	338	455	7	7

Vote of Associations

	4 ballots with numerical record of votes		3 ballots with "yes" or "no" votes	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Is the creation of a department of education with a secretary in the President's cabinet endorsed?.....	24	5	2	1
2. Is the principle of Federal aid to education in the States on condition that the States match the Federal appropriation endorsed?.....	22	6	2	1
3. Should a department of education supervise the expenditures of Federal appropriations in the States?..	21	7	1	2
4. Should a department of education be authorized to determine acceptable standards for various types of institutions within the States.....	23	6	1	2
5. endorsed without amendments?.....	14	10	1	2
6. Is an amendment of the Smith-Towner bill to provide for the inclusion of the Federal Board for Vocational Education in the department of education favored?.....	11	11	1	2
7. Is an amendment of the Smith-Towner bill to eliminate the proposed with States and to and report by the Depa distribution of Federal aid and the amounts needed for specific purposes favored?.....	8	14	0	3
8. Is an amendment to the Smith-Towner bill to provide for the appointment by the Department of Education of an advisory council favored?.....	18	5	2	1
9. Is the Kenyon bill endorsed?.....	2	9	0	3

first tabulation presents the votes of the institutional members of the Council; the second, the votes of those associations among the Council's constituent and associate membership that recorded their opinions. The questions asked on the ballot are repeated in connection with both tabulations.

The ballot contained a tenth question: "Is any other policy of Federal participation in education suggested?" The majority of the ballots recorded no vote on this question. No constructive suggestions were submitted.

A large number of institutions informed the Council's office that a reply to the questions asked on the ballot seemed to be inexpedient, in view of the great diversity of opinion among members of their respective staffs. Several other institutions, instead of answering the ballot questions, submitted statements which they judged to express more accurately the views of their respective faculties than would a formal vote on the specific questions submitted. It is believed that a number of these communications are of sufficient importance to merit reproduction in full or in part.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE ASSOCIATION OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES.

Your committee, appointed to consider and report upon the question of the relations of the land-grant colleges to the measure known as the Smith-Towner bill and to recommend a policy in connection therewith, begs to submit the following report:

Concerning the general purpose of the bill "To encourage the States in the promotion and support of education" and more specifically to provide for the "preparation of teachers; equalizing educational opportunities; physical and health education; Americanization; removal of illiteracy; and the organization by the Federal Government of a strong, central department of education in which real leadership of the Nation's educational agencies shall be developed," there can be no difference of opinion. These aims are to be sought and supported by all who have the interests of education at heart.

The members of the committee differ among themselves on the question as to the desirability of making the head of the proposed Federal education department a member of the President's cabinet, objections being based on the fact that this office is political and temporary, whereas educational leadership should be permanent and nonpolitical.

The committee entertains the profound conviction that under no circumstances can it approve of legislation which might result in giving Federal authority control over the educational systems of the respective States either directly or indirectly. In its present form the bill specifically provides that all of the educational facilities provided for shall be "or-

ganized, supervised and administered exclusively by the legally constituted State and local educational authorities," and that the proposed Secretary of Education "shall exercise no authority in relation thereto except as herein provided to insure that all funds apportioned to (the States) shall be used for the purposes for which they are appropriated." The authors of the bill are emphatic in their assurances that it has been their purpose to safeguard this point, and as the bill now stands your committee believes this has been accomplished.

The proposed legislation contains a provision which is potentially of the utmost importance to the land-grant colleges and to which the committee desires to call the careful attention of the members of this Association. Section 3 provides that "the President is authorized and empowered in his discretion to transfer to the Department of Education such offices, bureaus, divisions, boards or branches of the Government, connected with or attached to any of the executive departments or organized independently of any department, as in his judgment should be controlled by, or the functions of which should be exercised by, the Department of Education."

Under this provision, it would be possible to transfer the land-grant colleges and all their activities, including research and extension, to the proposed new department, thus severing completely the relations under which for more than fifty years our institutions have so happily and successfully developed. The possibility of such a result may well occasion apprehension in our minds, and should in the opinion of the committee stimulate such action by this Association as will tend to avoid such a contingency.

Your committee would, therefore, recommend the adoption of the following statement as an expression of the attitude of this Association towards the proposed legislation:

1. We approve the general purposes of the bill, relating to the encouragement of education.
2. We favor National leadership of, and financial assistance to, public education.
3. We oppose Federal control of State and local education.
4. Since the land-grant colleges are higher institutions of learning established on Federal and State statutes, and have maintained satisfactory relations with the Federal Department of Agriculture, now well established by more than fifty years of successful operation, we favor enactment of such guaranties as will safeguard these relationships.¹

REPORT OF THE FACULTY OF DENISON UNIVERSITY.

The faculty of Denison University has given careful consideration to the referendum on proposed Federal legislation providing for the creation of a department of education and Federal aid for education.

We favor the creation of a national department of education presided over by a secretary with the rank of a cabinet officer, hoping that the

¹NOTE.—The question of the Association's attitude toward the Smith-Towner Bill was brought before the annual meeting of the Association at Springfield, Mass., October 19-21, 1920.

tenure of such secretary would be determined not by change of administration but by his efficiency.

We believe that by the creation of such a department education would be given a part in determining national and international policies more in keeping with its importance, and by the consolidation of numerous small educational divisions and boards now scattered through the different Federal departments large economy and increase in effectiveness will result.

We believe that the function of the department should be that of research and dissemination of knowledge, the expert investigation of educational problems of broad bearing and central significance, and the giving to the public of these findings in such a way as to stimulate it to action.

We do not favor an annual appropriation by the Federal Government of one hundred million dollars. We believe the States are financially capable of managing their own educational affairs and that they need the guidance of expert suggestion and the incentive of clearly recognized objectives more than national monetary assistance.

We disapprove the Kenyon bill because of its centralization of too much authority in the Federal Government.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT OF RADCLIFFE COLLEGE.

I submitted to the Radcliffe Council yesterday the question of approving the Smith-Towner bill or other bills of a similar character. Previously the whole matter had been looked up by a member of the Council who is something of an expert in such matters. The vote of the Council would be against such an appropriation at this time. All of us believe that there should be a strong department in Washington to look out for the interests of the Government in education; but we do not believe that, without an extremely careful and thorough investigation, it is wise to distribute a sum of money vast enough to pay the interest on a substantial part of our national debt, among the States in the manner proposed. We are doubtful whether education requires such assistance from the Government, and more than doubtful whether we are yet authorized to believe that the money will be wisely spent.

I am summarizing as nearly as I can the feeling of our Council.

ACTION OF THE SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

In compliance with the request of the American Council on Education, the Senate of the University of Chicago has given consideration to the Smith-Towner bill and the Kenyon bill, now pending before the Congress of the United States, and to the summary of arguments for and against these bills published by the Council as a basis for a referendum. After such consideration the Senate submits, as its reply to the referendum, the following statement of the defects which it finds in the present bills and of the general principles which in its

judgment should be embodied in Federal legislation on education.

The following defects in the pending bills are noted:

The scope and character of Federal participation in education are not adequately defined. Especially is the situation left wholly ambiguous with regard to the relation of education in the common branches to education in industrial and agricultural courses.

There is no consistent policy with regard to the relation of the Federal Government and the States. In certain sections of the Smith-Towner bill, as in sections 10 and 13, the principle of Federal supervision is clearly recognized, while in section 14 a principle of exclusive State control of schools is enunciated.

The sums of money to be appropriated from the Federal treasury are chosen without adequate background of information regarding the needs and capacities of the various States; and the principles of distribution of such sums as are named are unscientific and inadequate.

There is no consideration of the problems of higher education and no provision for the proper coordination of the different levels of American education into a coherent system.

In view of these defects in the pending bills, it seems fitting to urge that the whole matter be recanvassed for the purpose of framing a substitute measure which will unite the interests of those who have been active in promoting the present bills, as well as of those who, through their representatives in the American Council on Education, have initiated the present discussion and referendum. As a contribution to such a movement for complete revision the following outline of general principles is submitted and advocated.

Whatever Federal agency is set up for the promotion of education should be so organized as to give explicit recognition to the fact that the public-school system of the United States is a unit system, not a system administratively divided so as to separate general education from industrial education or higher schools from lower.

Federal participation in education is desirable in so far as it provides for the study and presentation of standards of education and provides agencies to promote the acceptance of these standards by communities in all parts of the country. This principle contemplates the creation of an agency which is primarily scientific in character, after the analogy of the Department of Agriculture. The activities of such an agency may lead to far-reaching movements in American education, and it is wholly undesirable at this time to lay down negative principles which will limit the establishment of national standards. It is desirable that Federal subsidies, if such are to be made, be based on the broad and thoroughly scientific consideration of the principles which govern, and are to govern, the securing of all types of school revenues.

Any Federal educational agency created by Congress should be competent to present to Congress from time to time plans for the enlargement of the American educational system and should be competent to admin-

ister with authority such laws as Congress may enact pertaining to education. It should not be competent to issue rules and regulations, as is the present Board for Vocational Education, nor, on the other hand, should it be limited in its scope, as is the present Bureau of Education, to the mere collection of information. Above all, it should not have as its chief function the disbursing of appropriations to the States.

In short, a plan of national participation in education should be evolved which will operate to equalize educational opportunities and improve standards in all sections of the country. This plan should be based at every step on definite reports laid before Congress and should become operative to the extent, and only to the extent, to which Congress gives its explicit approval.

As in other matters, so also in the case of Federal appropriations, action should not be taken in loose, general terms and monies should not be turned over to the States without full and explicit definition by Congress of the relation of Federal expenditures to local expenditures, both with regard to the needs which are to be met and also with regard to the standards which are to be attained.

Appropriations other than those which provide for the maintenance of a scientific Federal agency are at this time premature, and any action providing for such appropriations should be detached from the bill dealing with the fundamental issue which is that of providing a proper agency to make investigations and recommendations to Congress.

The Senate of the University of Chicago, believing as it does in the great importance of the proposal that a Federal educational agency of broad scope be created, and holding that adherence to the foregoing principles is essential to the adoption of wise measures, urges that the American Council on Education make the problem of promoting the full discussion of this matter one of its major undertakings and that it take steps to secure a full hearing before Congress and the President of the United States.

CONCLUSIONS

From the foregoing summaries it would be apparent that the membership of the American Council on Education is by no means in agreement with respect to any one of the large issues raised in the referendum ballot. All that the returns show are certain trends of opinion. The most important of these appear to be the following:

1. An overwhelming majority of the membership of the Council voting favors the creation of a department of education.
2. An almost equally large majority of the Council's membership believes that the Smith-Towner bill should be amended.
3. The amendment most generally favored is one providing

for the inclusion of the Federal Board for Vocational Education in a new department from the outset.

4. Opinion is nearly evenly divided on the advisability of large Federal appropriations to the States on condition that the States match the appropriations.

5. A considerable majority favor the appointment of an advisory council by the department of education.

The following constitute the seventeen institutions voting "yes" or "no" on the propositions submitted in the ballot:

Colorado College.

Catholic University of America.

James Millikin University.

Johns Hopkins University.

University of Maryland.

Boston University.

Mount Holyoke College.

Wheaton College.

University of Michigan.

Carleton College.

University of Minnesota.

Drury College.

Oberlin College.

Western College for Women.

Bryn Mawr College.

Carnegie Institute of Technology.

Lawrence College.

Below are listed institutions returning ballots with a numerical record of votes:

California Institute of Technology.

Leland Stanford Junior University.

University of Southern California.

Colorado State Teachers' College.

Wesleyan University.

Northwestern University.

University of Illinois.

Rose Polytechnic Institute.

University of Notre Dame.

Cornell College.

Grinnell College.

Iowa State Teachers' College.

University of Kentucky.

Bowdoin College.

Tufts College.

Wellesley College.

Kalamazoo College.

St. Olaf College.

College of St. Thomas.
Southeast Missouri State Teachers' College.
University of Montana.
Dartmouth College.
Alfred University.
University of Rochester.
Wells College.
St. Genevieve's College.
Case School of Applied Science.
Lake Erie College.
Marietta College.
Municipal University of Akron.
Otterbein University.
Western Reserve University.
University of Oregon.
Allegheny College.
Drexel Institute.
Grove City College.
Lafayette College.
Lehigh University.
Temple University.
University of Pennsylvania.
Sweet Briar College.
Beloit College.
Marquette University.
Milwaukee-Downer College.
St. Clara College.
One Ballot received without name of college.

The following associations returned ballots with "yes" or "no" votes:

The Association of Urban Universities.
The Catholic Educational Association.
The National Institution for Moral Instruction.

The following associations returned ballots with numerical votes:

The American Association of University Professors.
The Association of Collegiate Alumnae.
The Council of Church Boards of Education.
The National Council of Normal Schools Presidents and Principals.

Resolutions were submitted by the Faculty of the University of Colorado, the Council of Radcliffe College, the Faculty of Denison University, the Faculty of Huron College, the Faculty of Colgate University, the Senate of the University of Chicago, the Association of Land-Grant Colleges.

The Smith-Towner Bill Reported by the House Committee on Education

ON January 17, 1921, Mr. Towner of the Committee on Education of the House of Representatives reported the Smith-Towner Bill to the House with certain amendments. His report merits the attention of educational officers.

After calling the attention of the House to the amendments made in the Bill by the Committee, Mr. Towner presented the Bill as amended and then analyzed it. This portion of his report is printed in full below:

A BILL to create a Department of Education, to authorize appropriations for the conduct of said department, to authorize the appropriation of money to encourage the States in the promotion and support of education, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby created an executive department in the Government to be called the Department of Education, with a Secretary of Education, who shall be the head thereof, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive a salary of \$12,000 per annum, and whose tenure of office shall be the same as that of the heads of other executive departments; and section 158 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to include such department, and the provisions of title 4 of the Revised Statutes, including all amendments thereto, are hereby made applicable to said department. The Secretary of Education shall cause a seal of office to be made for such department of such device as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken of said seal.

Sec. 2. That there shall be in said department an assistant secretary of education, to be appointed by the President, who shall receive a salary of \$5,000 per annum. He shall perform such duties as may be prescribed by the secretary or required by law. There shall also be one chief clerk and a disbursing clerk and such chiefs of bureaus and clerical assistants as may from time to time be authorized by Congress.

Sec. 3. That there is hereby transferred to the Department of Education the Bureau of Education, and such offices, bureaus, divisions, boards, or branches of the Government, connected with or attached to any of the executive departments or organized independently of any department, as Congress may determine should be administered by the Department of Education, and all such offices, bureaus, divisions, boards, or branches of the Government so transferred by act of Congress shall thereafter be administered by the Department of Education, as hereinafter provided.

All officers, clerks, and employees employed in or by any office, bureau, division, board, or branch of the Government, transferred in accordance with the provisions of this act to the Department of Education, shall each and all be transferred to said Department of Education at their existing grades and salaries, except where otherwise provided in this act; and the office records and papers on file and pertaining exclusively to the business of any such office, bureau, division, board, or branch of the Government so transferred, together with the furniture and equipment thereof, shall be transferred to said department.

Sec. 4. That the Secretary of Education shall have charge, in the buildings or premises occupied by or assigned to the Department of Education, of the library, furniture, fixtures, records, and other property used therein or pertaining thereto, and may expend for rental of appropriate quarters for the accommodation of the Department of Education within the District of Columbia, and for the library, furniture, equipment, and all other incidental expenses, such sums as Congress may provide from time to time.

All power and authority conferred by law upon or exercised by the head of any executive department, or by any administrative board, over any officer, office, bureau, division, board, or branch of the Government, transferred in accordance with the provisions of this act to the Department of Education, and any and all business arising therefrom or pertaining thereto, and all duties performed in connection therewith, shall, after such transfer, be vested in and exercised by the Secretary of Education.

All laws prescribing the work and defining the duties and powers of the several offices, bureaus, divisions, boards, or branches of the Government, transferred in accordance with the provisions of this act to the Department of Education, shall, in so far as the same are not in conflict with the provisions of this act, remain in full force and effect and be executed by the Secretary of Education, to whom is hereby granted definite authority to reorganize the work of any and all of the said offices, bureaus, divisions, boards, or branches of the Government so transferred in such way as will in his judgment best accomplish the purposes of this act.

Sec. 5. That it shall be the duty of the Department of Education to conduct studies and investigations in the field of education and to report thereon. Research shall be undertaken in (a) illiteracy; (b) immigrant education; (c) public school education, and especially rural education; (d) physical education, including health education, recreation, and sanitation; (e) preparation and supply of competent teachers for the public schools; (f) higher education; and in such other fields as, in the judgment of the Secretary of Education, may require attention and study.

In order to carry out the provisions of this section the Secretary of Education is authorized, in the same manner as provided for appointments in other departments, to make appointments, or recommendations of appointments, of educational attaches to foreign embassies, and of such investigators and representatives as may be needed, subject to the appropriations that have been made or may hereafter be made to any office, bureau, division, board, or branch of the Government transferred in ac-

cordance with the provisions of this act to the Department of Education; and where appropriations have not been made therefor the appropriation provided in section 6 of this act shall be made available.

Sec. 6. That for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and annually thereafter, the sum of \$500,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Department of Education, for the purpose of paying salaries and conducting investigations and paying all incidental and traveling expenses and rent where necessary, and for the purpose of enabling the Department of Education to carry out the provisions of this act. And all appropriations which have been made and which may hereafter be made to any office, bureau, division, board, or branch of the Government, transferred in accordance with the provisions of this act to the Department of Education, are hereby continued in full force and effect, and shall be administered by the Secretary of Education in such manner as is prescribed by law.

Sec. 7. That in order to encourage the States in the promotion and support of education, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and annually thereafter, \$100,000,000, to be apportioned, disbursed, and expended as hereinafter provided.

Sec. 8. That in order to encourage the States to remove illiteracy, three-fortieths of the sum authorized to be appropriated by section 7 of this act shall be used for the instruction of illiterates 14 years of age and over. Such instruction shall deal with the common-school branches and the duties of citizenship, and when advisable shall prepare for some definite occupation. Said sum shall be apportioned to the States in the proportions which their respective illiterate populations of 14 years of age and over, not including foreign-born illiterates, bear to such total illiterate population of the United States, not including outlying possessions, according to the last preceding census of the United States.

Sec. 9. That in order to encourage the States in the Americanization of immigrants, three-fortieths of the sum authorized to be appropriated by section 7 of this act shall be used to teach immigrants 14 years of age and over to speak and read the English language and to understand and appreciate the spirit and purpose of the American Government and the duties of citizenship in a free country. The said sum shall be apportioned to the States in the proportions which their respective foreign-born populations bear to the total foreign-born population of the United States, not including outlying possessions, according to the last preceding census of the United States.

Sec. 10. That in order to encourage the States to equalize educational opportunities five-tenths of the sum authorized to be appropriated by section 7 of this act shall be used in public elementary and secondary schools for the partial payment of teachers' salaries, for providing better instruction and extending school terms, especially in rural schools and schools in sparsely settled localities, and otherwise providing equally good educational opportunities for the children in the several States,

and for the extension and adaptation of public libraries for educational purposes. The said sum shall be apportioned to the States, one-half in the proportions which the number of children between the ages of 6 and 21 of the respective States bear to the total number of such children in the United States, and one-half in the proportions which the number of public-school teachers employed in teaching positions in the respective States bear to the total number of public-school teachers so employed in the United States, not including outlying possessions, said apportionment to be based upon statistics collected annually by the Department of Education: *Provided, however,* That in order to share in the apportionment provided by this section a State shall establish and maintain the following requirements, unless prevented by constitutional limitations, in which case these requirements shall be approximated as nearly as constitutional provisions will permit: (a) A legal school term of at least 24 weeks in each year for the benefit of all children of school age in such State; (b) a compulsory school-attendance law requiring all children between the ages of 7 and 14 to attend some school for at least 24 weeks in each year; (c) a law requiring that the English language shall be the basic language of instruction in the common-school branches in all schools, public and private.

Sec. 11. That in order to encourage the States in the promotion of physical education, two-tenths of the sum authorized to be appropriated by section 7 of this act shall be used for physical education and instruction in the principles of health and sanitation. The said sum shall be apportioned to the States in the proportions which their respective populations bear to the total population of the United States, not including outlying possessions, according to the last preceding census of the United States.

Sec. 12. That in order to encourage the States in the preparation of teachers for public-school service, particularly in rural schools, three-twentieths of the sum authorized to be appropriated by section 7 of this act shall be used to provide and extend facilities for the improvement of teachers already in service and for the more adequate preparation of prospective teachers, and to provide an increased number of trained and competent teachers by encouraging, through the establishment of scholarships and otherwise, a greater number of talented young people to make adequate preparation for public-school service. The said sum shall be apportioned to the States in the proportions which the number of public-school teachers employed in teaching positions in the respective States bear to the total number of public-school teachers so employed in the United States, not including outlying possessions, said apportionments to be based on statistics collected annually by the Department of Education.

Sec. 13. That in order to secure the benefits of the appropriation authorized in section 7, and of any of the apportionments made in sections 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 of this act, a State shall, by legislative enactment, accept the provisions of this act and provide for the administration and distribution of such funds as may be apportioned

to said State, and shall designate the State's chief educational authority, whether a State superintendent of public instruction, a commissioner of education, a State board of education, or other legally constituted chief educational authority, to represent said State in the administration of this act, and such authority so designated shall be recognized by the Secretary of Education: *Provided*, That in any State in which the legislature does not meet in 1921, the governor of said State, in so far as he may have authority so to do, may take such action, temporarily, as is herein provided to be taken by legislative enactment in order to secure the benefits of this act, and such action by the governor shall be recognized by the Secretary of Education for the purposes of this act, when reported by the chief educational authority designated to represent said State, until the legislature of said State shall have met in due course and been in session 60 days.

In any State accepting the provisions of this act the State treasurer shall be designated and appointed as custodian of all funds received by said State as apportionments under the provisions of this act, to receive and provide for the proper custody and disbursement of the same, such disbursements to be made in accordance with the legal provisions of said State, on warrants duly drawn by the State's chief educational authority designated to represent said State in the administration of this act.

A State may accept the provisions of any one or more of the respective apportionments authorized in sections 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 of this act, and may defer the acceptance of any one or more of said apportionments: *Provided, however*, That no money shall be apportioned to any State from any of the funds provided in sections 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 of this act unless a sum at least equally as large shall be provided by said State, or by local authorities, or by both, for the same purpose: *And provided*, That the sum or sums provided by a State for the equalization of educational opportunities, for the promotion of physical education, and for the preparation of teachers shall not be less for any year than the amount provided for the same purpose for the fiscal year next preceding the acceptance of the provisions of this act by said State: *And provided further*, That no money apportioned to any State under the provisions of this act shall be used by any State or local authority, directly or indirectly, for the purchase, rental, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or equipment, or for the purchase or rental of land, or for the payment of debts or the interest thereon.

Sec. 14. That when a State shall have accepted the provisions of this act and shall have provided for the distribution and administration of such funds as may be apportioned to said State, as herein provided, the State's chief educational authority designated to represent said State shall so report in writing to the Secretary of Education. If such report shows that said State has complied with the provisions of this act with respect to any one or more of the apportionments authorized in sections 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 of this act, the Secretary of Education shall apportion to said State for the fiscal year, or for the remainder of the

fiscal year, as the case may be, such funds as said State may be entitled to receive under the provisions of this act, and shall certify such apportionment or apportionments to the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That courses of study, plans, and methods for carrying out the purposes and provisions of this act within a State shall be determined by the State and local educational authorities of said State, and this act shall not be construed to require uniformity of courses of study, plans, and methods in the several States in order to secure the benefits herein provided: *And provided further*, That all the educational facilities encouraged by the provisions of this act and accepted by a State shall be organized, supervised, and administered exclusively by the legally constituted State and local educational authorities of said State, and the Secretary of Education shall exercise no authority in relation thereto except as herein provided to insure that all funds apportioned to said State shall be used for the purposes for which they are appropriated by Congress.

Sec. 15. That the Secretary of Education is authorized to prescribe plans for keeping accounts of the expenditures of such funds as may be apportioned to the States under the provisions of this act and to audit such accounts. The Secretary of Education may withhold the apportionment or apportionments of any State for the next ensuing fiscal year whenever he shall determine that such apportionment or apportionments made to said State for the current fiscal year are not being expended in accordance with the provisions of this act: *Provided, however*, That before withholding any such apportionment from any State, as herein provided, the Secretary of Education shall give due notice in writing to the chief educational authority designated to represent said State, stating specifically wherein said State fails to comply with the provisions of this act.

If any portion of the money received by the treasurer of a State under the provisions of this act for any of the purposes herein provided shall, by action or contingency, be diminished or lost, the same shall be replaced by said State, and until so replaced no subsequent apportionment for such purpose shall be paid to said State. If any part of the funds apportioned annually to any State for any of the purposes named in sections 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 of this act has not been expended for such purpose, a sum equal to such unexpended part shall be deducted from the next succeeding annual apportionment made to said State for such purpose.

Sec. 16. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay quarterly, on the 1st day of July, October, January, and April, to the treasurer of any State designated to receive such funds, such apportionment or apportionments as are properly certified to him by the secretary of education, and he shall discontinue such payments when notified so to do by the Secretary of Education, as provided in this act.

Sec. 17. That the chief educational authority designated to represent any State receiving the benefits of this act shall, not later than September

1 of each year, make a report to the Secretary of Education showing the work done in said State in carrying out the provisions of this act and the receipts and expenditures of money apportioned to said State under the provisions of this act. If the chief educational authority designated to represent any State shall fail to report as herein provided, the Secretary of Education shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury to discontinue the payment of all apportionments to said State until such report shall have been made.

Sec. 18. That the Secretary of Education shall annually at the close of each fiscal year make a report in writing to Congress giving an account of all moneys received and disbursed by the Department of Education and describing the work done by the department. He shall also, not later than December 1 of each year, make a report to Congress on the administration of sections 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17 of this act, and shall include in said report a summary of the reports made to him by the several States showing the condition of public education therein, and shall at the same time make such recommendations to Congress as will, in his judgment, improve public education in the United States. He shall also from time to time make such special investigations and reports as may be required of him by the President or by Congress.

Sec. 19. That this act shall take effect April 1, 1921, and all acts and parts of acts in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

ANALYSIS AND GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

The bill creates a Department of Education with a Secretary at its head, who shall be a member of the President's Cabinet. The first six sections of the bill provide for the organization of this department. There are many reasons why this should be done. It is generally admitted that the education of its citizens is the most important work in which a government can engage. This is especially true in a republic. A nation can be properly governed only when it is intelligently governed. While the United States is more dependent than almost any other nation upon education for the successful conduct of its Government, it is about the only nation in the world that has not given education primary recognition, for nearly all the other nations have departments or ministries of education with their heads members of the cabinet.

Early in our history we began making appropriations to the States in lands and money for educational purposes. We have undertaken the work both directly and indirectly. There are now 30 or more different parts of the Government service doing educational work, and we are annually making large appropriations from the National Treasury for their support. Yet the only recognition we have given education at the seat of government is the establishment of a small bureau in the Department of the Interior. There is no coordination of the various educa-

tional activities of the Government. There is no head to direct the work. The Commissioner of Education has no authority over the educational work of the Government outside his own bureau, which has but a subordinate place, supported by only small appropriations. To concentrate and coordinate this work will make both for efficiency and economy. To give to education the recognition in the Federal system which its importance merits is one of the principal objects of the bill.

AID FROM THE FEDERAL TREASURY

The remaining sections of the bill provide for the authorizations of appropriations from the Federal Treasury to aid and encourage the States in particular branches of educational work which are especially urgent. These authorizations for appropriations are made contingent upon the States appropriating an amount at least equally as large for the same purpose. The particular branches of educational work to be thus aided and encouraged are: the removal of illiteracy, the Americanization of immigrants, the equalization of educational opportunities, the promotion of physical education, and the preparation of teachers.

ILLITERACY

The extent of illiteracy in the United States is so great as to amount not only to a national disgrace but a national menace as well. According to the census of 1910, there were in the United States 5,500,000 persons 10 years of age and over who could not read or write any language. In addition there were 3,500,000 who could not speak, read, or write English. These statistics put us in ninth place among the nations, with most of the civilized world ahead of us. The disclosures of the last census as to illiteracy are not yet available, but it is believed that the percentage of illiteracy has not been substantially reduced since 1910.

Our alarming condition was graphically disclosed by the examination of the draft registrants during the late war. The Surgeon General's report showed that of the men called to service between the ages of 21 and 31 nearly 25 per cent were practically illiterate. The Nation's defense is thus doubly impaired. First, because one-fourth of the sons of America called to serve are incapacitated for efficient service by being so ignorant and illiterate that they can not understand the orders given them; and, second, because in a free country its safety is jeopardized when its voters can not read the ballots they cast and only know how to vote as they are told.

The economic loss is tremendous. Secretary Lane estimated the annual loss to the Nation because of illiteracy alone at \$825,000,000. The Director of the Bureau of Mines states that

of the 1,000,000 men engaged in mining in the United States 620,000 are foreigners, and that 460,000 of these can not speak English. He states that the removal of illiteracy among the miners would save annually 1,000 lives and 150,000 injuries. Investigation has shown that one-half the industrial accidents are the result of ignorance, because the workers can not read the danger warnings or understand the orders given.

It has been said that illiteracy is a southern problem. The facts do not warrant that conclusion. Georgia has 89,000 illiterates, but New York has 406,000. Alabama has 352,000, while Pennsylvania has 354,000. Louisiana has 352,000, Mississippi 290,000, and Texas has 282,000, but Illinois has 168,000, Ohio 124,000, and New Jersey 113,000. Even Massachusetts has 141,000, and undertakes to partially solve her illiteracy problem by depriving them of the right to vote.

It is thought by many that illiteracy is a race question. But it is much more than that. There are over 1,000,000 more white illiterates in the United States than illiterate negroes.

AMERICANIZATION

Closely allied with the problem of the removal of illiteracy is the Americanization of our foreign born. We have now more than 15,000,000 foreign-born population in the United States. More than 5,000,000 can not read or write the English language. More than 2,000,000 can not read or write any language. This mass of ignorance is not merely a negative evil; it has become and is now an active source of danger to the Republic. Alien communities where our language is not spoken, where our magazines and newspapers are not read, and where no American ideals or any understanding of our institutions are made known constitute a rich soil in which are sown the seeds of unrest and revolt. Alien agitators who advocate the destruction of our Government, whose only purpose in coming to our shores is to excite revolution by violence, find here their opportunity. These revolutionists whom we have mistakenly allowed to come to this country easily win the confidence of their countrymen and easily lead them astray. Most of the difficulties among foreign workingmen have their origin in the evil work of these foreign malcontents and trouble makers.

There is but one cure for these conditions, and that is to educate the immigrant to understand our language, our Government, and our institutions. We are ourselves largely to blame. We admit the foreigner on easy terms and then let him shift for himself. We should surround him from the first with an atmosphere of helpful and patriotic influence. We should teach him to know what a free government is and what America really means. A man can not love a country which he does not under-

stand. He can not appreciate and cherish institutions which are incomprehensible to him.

The task of the Americanization of immigrants, as well as that of the removal of illiteracy, is very largely an adult problem. The children we hope will be cared for in the schools. But there are few schools and few facilities of any kind for the education of grown men and women. That fact makes the problem more difficult, and accounts in part for the delay and reluctance of the States to meet the demand. But the difficulty must be faced. It is the duty of both the States and the Nation to meet it, and it is hoped that by an effective cooperation in the work we may be able within a few years to materially better the conditions that now exist.

EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Provision is made for an appropriation to encourage the States to equalize educational opportunities for the youth of the land. That great inequalities exist within and among the States is well known. In the South a large proportion of the Negro children never see the inside of a schoolhouse. In the North there is hardly a city that has adequate school facilities for all its children. In some rural communities and factory districts the value of the property is so small that local taxation can not support the schools. In other sparsely settled communities means must be provided to carry pupils to central schools. The differences between the city and country schools are marked. On an average the country boy has two months less of a school year than the city boy. Through the eight grades this amounts to one year and four months' advantage given the city boy over the country boy.

Unfortunately it is found that where the educational needs are greatest the schools are most inadequate. All over our land the poorest schools are in the poorest communities—just where the best schools are most needed. Through national cooperation with the States and the local communities these unfortunate conditions can be largely remedied. It should be the Nation's task to so encourage the States and cooperate with them that every child in America, whether born in a city or in a remote rural district, shall have the advantage of at least a common-school education. The idea is fundamentally sound that the Nation, the State, and the local community should share in the responsibility and the expense of supporting an adequate and equalized system of public education.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

The Provost Marshal General's report revealed the startling fact that more than one-third of the men examined for military

service in the late war were disqualified by reason of physical disability. It is also stated that 90 per cent of these hundreds of thousands of young men thus classed as physical defectives unfit for military service could have qualified had they been taught the application of the simplest rules of hygiene and health. It was ignorance, gross ignorance, that in the vast majority of cases was the cause of their incompetence.

If one-third of our young men are diseased and unfit to fight for their country, they are unfit to make their full contribution to the life and progress of the Nation. They can not bring to their families, to the community, or to the Nation a man's share of its obligation and service. In a double sense physical education is a national interest. Not only because a physical defective is a burden to the Nation, but because it is as necessary to have sound men as it is to have effective guns and ammunition for the Nation's defense. The addition to the dynamic power of the Nation, the strengthening of all the forces that make not only for national defense but for progress, even the increase of moral strength that would come from observance of the fundamental principles of healthful living, are incalculable.

There is but one adequate and sensible course, to adopt and put into operation as part of our school curriculum a system of physical education in its broadest and best sense. Unfortunately this has not been generally done. The additional cost deprives many schools and thousands of children of this essential element of education, with the unfortunate results already referred to. As the Nation has an immediate interest in the physical fitness of its citizens, it is only proper it should bear a part of the expense and do something toward stimulating the activity of the States in this regard.

PREPARATION OF TEACHERS

It is generally admitted by those who have given thought to the subject that the most pressing educational problem in America is how to overcome the difficulty of securing competent teachers for our schools. Thousands of schools are closed because teachers can not be obtained. Tens of thousands of schools are taught by incompetent teachers. Over 100,000 teachers now teaching American youth are less than 20 years old; 30,000 have no education beyond the eighth grade; 200,000 have less than a high-school education; 300,000 have no professional training whatever.

The principal cause of this is that teachers have been paid less wages than almost any other class engaged in private or public service. The average salary paid teachers in the United States last year was \$640. This is less than the wages paid scrub women or ditch diggers. It is only a fraction of the amount paid mechanics. It must be manifest that such conditions

will drive all competent and self-respecting teachers from their work. It is certainly the duty of the people of the United States to bring up to at least a scale of reason and justice the salaries of the teachers of the country.

But it is also the duty of the people to see that adequate means for the preparation of teachers be made available on such terms as will induce competent young men and women to engage in teaching. And this is not merely a local problem nor a State problem; it is a national problem as well. It is undoubtedly one of the principal duties of our schools to put into the minds and hearts of the youth of our land the principles of American liberty and justice and to teach them the blessings and the responsibility of American citizenship. Indifference as to the want of school privileges or as to the character of the schools and their teachers will inevitably result in the deterioration of our citizenship and endanger the life of the Nation. It is to aid and encourage the States in the work of preparing competent teachers for all the schools within their borders, both public and private, that this provision is inserted in the bill.

OBJECTIONS

It is urged that this bill provides for an undue extension of the powers of the General Government; that education is properly a State function and should not be invaded by the Nation. In reply to this objection it may be said that the legislation proposed does not usurp the powers of the States in their control of education. On the contrary, the control and management of the schools by State and local authorities is most carefully preserved, and very definite and positive provision is made against any interference on the part of the Federal Government. It can not be too strongly stated that this bill is to aid and encourage, and not to control. The bill instead of granting power to the Federal Government to control education within the States in the strongest possible provisions guards against it. The Secretary of Education is denied the right to establish standards or to exercise any power over the conduct of the schools. The only standards or conditions which must be met by the States in order to receive the benefits provided are clearly stated in the bill. All details with respect to courses of study, plans, and methods are left entirely to the States.

It can not be said that national aid for education is a new proposition. As a matter of historic fact, the policy of making grants by the National Government for the education of the people antedates the adoption of the Constitution. The land act of 1785 provided for the survey of the Northwest Territory and set aside therein lot No. 16 in every township for "the maintenance of public schools within said township." The ordinance of

1787 declared that "Schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." In 1826 the section-grant provision was applied to the Louisiana purchase. In 1848, in the Oregon Territory land act, sections 16 and 36 were set aside for the public schools. Nor were grants of land only made by the General Government. In 1818 the act admitting Illinois set aside the "5 per cent" funds for education. The surplus distributions were used largely for that purpose. In 1863 the Morrill Act providing for the establishment of the "land-grant colleges" in each State was signed by President Lincoln. This was strengthened by the Hatch Act in 1887. The second Morrill Act, passed in 1890, gave \$25,000 a year to each land-grant college. This was increased first to \$30,000 and then to \$80,000 a year in cash from the National Treasury. The Smith-Lever Act of 1914 gave further increases for extension work and farmers' institutes. The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, providing for assistance to the States for the promotion of vocational education, gives a total maximum appropriation from the National Government annually of \$7,200,000 for that purpose.

It is evident that the policy was early adopted and has been since maintained that the National Government shall, when National as well as State interests are involved, aid the States in the education of its citizens.

The additional demand which will be made upon the Treasury is urged as an objection. In the first place, it should be observed that the bill does not appropriate but merely authorizes appropriations. It establishes a limit rather than creates a burden. It is within the discretion of Congress to appropriate the whole or any part within that limit in any year. Besides, it is not at all probable that the entire amount provided will ever be called for. To absorb the entire amount all the States would have to qualify under all the five separate provisions every year. It is not likely that this will ever occur. Some States will qualify for aid in the removal of illiteracy. Others will not need it. Some will qualify for the Americanization of immigrants. Others will not do so. And this is the case with each of the five provisions. The Federal Government will respond only when the State shall deem its own need in that particular matter of sufficient importance to make at least an equal appropriation.

When Congress is to consider to which of the various demands for appropriations it will respond, it should make selection of those which are of greatest importance and omit those which are least justifiable. There is nothing of more importance in our scheme of Government than the education of the people. Whatever else may be left out, education can not safely be excluded. If there is any one thing that justifies a tax in the judgment of American citizens, it is that which strengthens and supports our public schools. There are many millions now appropriated

which have much less justification than the appropriations called for under the terms of this bill.

If education should be given the recognition which its importance requires, if illiteracy is a national peril, if ignorance of our language and institutions is a source of danger, if through the equalization of educational opportunities there should be guaranteed to every child in the land at least a common-school education, if the conservation of the physical well-being of the youth of our land is imperative from the standpoint of national welfare, if there should be provided for every boy and girl in America a competent, well-qualified teacher in order that there may be developed throughout our Nation an intelligent and enlightened citizenship, then it can be fairly said that this legislation is justified.

The Smith-Towner bill was not acted upon before the adjournment of Congress, March 4. It, therefore, died automatically. The office of the American Council on Education is informed that it will be reintroduced with certain further amendments as soon as Congress reassembles.

British Academic Credentials

RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE ADMISSION OF HOLDERS OF DEGREES FROM BRITISH INSTI- TUTIONS TO STUDY AT AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

THE Committee on International Educational Relations of the American Council on Education has designated a special subcommittee to make recommendations regarding the rating by American institutions of holders of academic credentials from universities and colleges in the British Empire. The following proposals are submitted by the committee for the information of college and university officers.

In the British Empire institutions and the degrees granted by them are not standardized by government authorities as in the Continental countries. The work offered by the various universities differs in advancement and in excellence. While perhaps the diversity of academic institutions going under the same name is not so great in the British Empire as in the United States, the situations are not fundamentally dissimilar.

It is the Committee's judgment that the interchange of undergraduate students between distant countries (except as this is already provided for by the Rhodes trust) should not be encouraged. It believes that as a rule men and women of the maturity of graduate students are the only ones who can derive enough profit from study in a foreign country to repay the effort involved. The Committee, therefore, makes no general recommendation concerning the treatment of undergraduate students. It expects that American colleges and universities which receive undergraduates from British institutions will admit them to those classes or those courses that the record of their previous studies indicate they are qualified to enter.

The Committee's recommendations are as follows:

1. That students or graduates of Canadian institutions who are candidates for admission to undergraduate or graduate standing at colleges and universities in the United States be classified for purposes of admission as if they had studied at American higher institutions.

2. That holders of the bachelor's degree from universities in England, Wales, and Ireland, and holders of the master's degree from universities in Scotland (the M. A. is the first degree at Scottish universities) be admitted to graduate registration in American universities, the status of each individual with reference to candidacy for a higher degree to be determined by the merits of his case.

3. That holders of the bachelor's degree from universities in Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa and from government universities in India be admitted to graduate registration in American universities, the status of each individual with reference to candidacy for a higher degree to be determined by the merits of his case.

4. That administrative officers should note that many holders of the bachelor's degree from institutions mentioned in paragraphs 2 and 3 may need to spend at least two years in preparation for the master's degree at an American university. But men who have graduated with high honors from universities in the British Isles and from some of the institutions noted in paragraph 3 will ordinarily proceed to the master's degree at an American institution in the minimum period

HERMAN V. AMES, *Chairman.*

FRANK AYDELOTTE,

J. W. CUNLIFFE,

S. P. DUGGAN,

CHARLES H. HASKINS,

F. J. F. JACKSON,

I. L. KANDEL,

K. LAKE,

A. O. LEUSCHNER,

S. P. CAPEN, *Secretary.*

The Junior College

The National Conference Committee on Standards of Colleges and Secondary Schools at its meeting held March 10, 1921, voted to accept and adopt the following report on the junior college presented by a subcommittee. Because of the importance of the subject and the wide influence of the National Conference Committee, the report is reprinted here.

The junior college is an institution covering the first two years of a standard college course, based upon the completion of four years of high school work. It may be a division of a large university offering a full college course but for administrative reasons dividing that course into two separate units each covering two years of work; it may be a separate institution, either rural or urban, under private or public control, established primarily either to meet local needs for post-high-school work, whether vocational or cultural, or to allow students to take the early years of their college course near their homes or in a comparatively small and closely supervised environment; it may be a graduate annex to a local high school organized primarily to gratify local pride or to aggrandize the local school system.

There are over a hundred such institutions in the country at present, and there is a marked tendency to increase the number. The institution has had its greatest development in the West and South, but it exists in all parts of the country, and the movement is general rather than local or regional.

In many cases the junior college meets a genuine need. It serves in a measure to relieve the enormous pressure of students on many of our universities, and by relieving that pressure helps to solve the troublesome problem of the assimilation of the freshman. It lightens the financial burden for many students by allowing them to take the first half of their college course at less expense than in a distant institution. For many it affords the opportunity at home and at small cost to pursue vocational or preprofessional studies that otherwise they would be unable to afford.

Since it thus meets definite needs, it is evidently here to stay, and the problem is not whether we shall have junior colleges, but how far they shall be encouraged, what standards shall be insisted on, and how far work done in them shall be accredited by standard colleges, by professional schools and by universities.

It may be set down as a safe working principle that junior colleges should be encouraged in so far as they meet genuine, legitimate needs, and that their work should be accepted and accredited in so far as it conforms to the standards maintained by colleges and universities of

recognized standing. This means that the institution must possess at least the minimum collegiate equipment, that the teachers must be of collegiate calibre, men and women of scholarly attainment, that the work must be done under college conditions, and that the atmosphere must be distinctly collegiate rather than secondary in character. In other words the work done in junior colleges must be recognized at its face value just as far as, and no farther than, it conforms to the standards of our recognized institutions.

The junior college as a division of a large university may be an administrative device of great value, but the institution in this form is something with which we are not particularly concerned at present.

The rural junior college may serve a very useful purpose, and it would undoubtedly be for the best interests of this country if many of the small institutions, with weak resources, which are vainly struggling to maintain themselves as second and third rate colleges would frankly recognize the situation, give up the struggle, limit their field, and make themselves into first-rate junior colleges, sending their students on to earn their degrees in standard institutions.

Some of our cities maintain strong and well equipped municipal colleges and even universities, and there is no reason why, if a local need exists, a larger number should not maintain junior colleges. It must be emphatically asserted, however, that if such an institution is to claim collegiate standing and collegiate recognition, it must maintain collegiate standards. It must ordinarily be a separate institution, with its own building, its own president, and its own faculty. It must possess adequate library and laboratory facilities for work of college grade. Its faculty must have higher scholarly attainments than the minimum necessary for successful high school work, and a reasonable proportion of the staff should have had experience in college teaching. The number of teaching hours required of them must be smaller than are ordinarily called for in high schools in order that they may have opportunity for proper study and preparation. The method of instruction should be collegiate rather than secondary, and the atmosphere should be the same.

The extension of a high school course by the addition of one or two years of more advanced work may meet a genuine local need, but such an annex to a high school is not necessarily worthy of collegiate standing. In general it may be said that such an institution with the high-school principal becoming the president of the college, with certain of the high-school teachers taking over the work of instruction, and carrying it on with the high-school facilities, does not deserve to be called a college and should not be recognized as such.

The Dante Sex-Centenary

THE office of the American Council on Education has received a note from the National Dante Committee which it takes pleasure in bringing to the attention of the Council's membership:

The year 1921 brings the six hundredth anniversary of the death of Dante. This year America will join with the other nations of the world in paying grateful tribute to a poet whose work is a common heritage.

That a mediaevalist should call forth the homage of the twentieth century to the extent of being honored in all civilized lands by peoples living under civilizations utterly different from that which he knew and by nations which for the most part do not know the language in which he wrote is a marvel explainable only on the grounds of his supreme genius. Because he saw humanity *sub specie aeternitatis*, his influence reaches around the world and across the centuries. As poet, he offers still the wonder of his vision, the echoing harmony of his verse, the profound insight of his human sympathy. As apostle, he utters still a message rich in counsel for just this modern world, a message that clarifies and quickens, that inspires and makes resolute.

It is, therefore, strongly urged that the colleges and universities of the United States worthily commemorate the sixth century of the poet's death. It is suggested that the centenary year be made the occasion for a wider and deeper study of his works. In particular there are suggested classes and public meetings; lectures, singly or in series; readings; exhibitions of books by Dante or on Dante; and displays of Dante portraits, of works of art derived from Dante, and of pictures of his Italy.

Inquiries may be addressed to the National Dante Committee, 23 West 43d Street, New York City.

Report of the Auditor

THE AMERICAN AUDIT COMPANY,
COLORADO BUILDING,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

February 8, 1921.

American Council on Education,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sirs:

We have audited your accounts and records from December 1, 1919, to December 31, 1920.

Our report, including Statement of Receipts and Disbursements, is as follows:

All Cash Receipts, shown by the records, are accounted for.

All Cash Disbursements are supported by vouchers and cancelled checks.

The Cash on Hand December 31, 1920, \$10,372.30, was on deposit in the bank.

Respectfully submitted,

THE AMERICAN AUDIT COMPANY,

By C. R. CRAMNER (Signed),

Resident Manager.

Approved: HARRY M. RICE (Signed),

Vice-President.

Attest: M. PICKETT (Signed),

Asst. Secretary.

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

From December 1, 1919, to December 31, 1920

RECEIPTS

Constituent Members	\$ 1,400.00
Associate Members	140.00
Institutional Members	22,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$23,540.00
Miscellaneous Donations	225.00
	<hr/>
	\$23,765.00
Cash Subscriptions to EDUCATIONAL RECORD	80.00
Sale of Furniture	25.00
Sale of Pamphlets	6.00
Interest on bank deposits	93.75
	<hr/>
Total Receipts	\$23,969.75
Cash on Hand December 1, 1919	6,573.34
	<hr/>
	\$30,543.09

DISBURSEMENTS

Salaries:

Director	\$8,125.00	
Stenographers and Clerks	2,946.35	11,071.35
Secretarial Services to June 30, 1920, Carleton College	100.00	
Rent	1,300.00	
Stationery, Printing, and Supplies	717.57	
Postage	237.01	
Telephone and Telegrams	271.21	
General Expense (Towel Service, etc.)57.18	
Traveling Expenses of Director	1,641.64	
Auditing, 1918-1919	325.00	
Annual Meeting:		
Cosmos Club	\$ 135.00	
Reporting	175.20	310.20

Committees:

Executive	\$ 290.11	
Selection of French Girls	1,146.00	
Education for Citizenship	347.64	
International Educational Relations	26.69	
Other Committees	24.69	1,835.13
Publication Expenses EDUCATIONAL RECORD	1,426.50	
R. L. Kelly, Balance 1919 Expenses	725.00	
Furniture and Fixtures, Addressograph, Mimeograph, and Typewriter	153.00	
Total Disbursements	20,170.79	
Cash on Hand, December 31, 1920	10,372.30	
	\$30,543.09	

The Educational Record

Published Quarterly By

The American Council on Education

Volume 2

July, 1921

No. 3

Editor:

SAMUEL PAUL CAPEN

CONTENTS

New Bills Affecting Education

By the Editor

A Department of Public Welfare

By Brigadier General Charles E. Sawyer, M. R. C.

Conference on Methods of College Standardization

By George D. Olds

Standards in Education

By Clyde Furst

The Present Standards of Voluntary Associations

By Kendric C. Babcock

Present Standards of State Departments of Education
and State Universities

By George F. Zook

Present Standards of the Catholic Educational Association

By Rt. Rev. Edward A. Pace

Present Standards of Protestant Church Boards of Education

By Robert L. Kelly

Dangers of the Standardization Movement

By Harry Pratt Judson

Objectives of Standardization of Higher Institutions

By James H. Kirkland

Recommendations Concerning the Admission of Holders of Certain Degrees and Certificates from Latin-American Institutions to Study at American Colleges and Universities

Annual Subscription, \$2.00

COPYRIGHT, 1921
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

New Bills Affecting Education

WITH the reconvening of Congress the measure formerly known as the Smith-Towner Bill was reintroduced with several amendments by Representative Towner and Senator Sterling. The principal amendment is the elimination of the provision authorizing an annual appropriation of one hundred million dollars to encourage the States in the promotion and support of education. In the new measure the sum of one hundred million dollars is not mentioned. Appropriations are, however, provided for each of the purposes specified in the former bill and the amounts are the same (see *EDUCATIONAL RECORD*, April, 1921, pages 54 to 56). In connection with each section carrying an appropriation the provision is specifically made that all funds apportioned to a State are to be distributed "and administered in accordance with the laws of said State in like manner as the funds provided by State and local authorities for the same purpose, and the State and local educational authorities of said State shall determine the courses of study, plans, and methods for carrying out the purposes of this section within said State in accordance with the laws thereof."

A new section provides for the creation of a National Council on Education to consult and advise with the Secretary of Education on subjects relating to the promotion and development of education in the United States. The Council is to consist of the chief educational authority of each State, not to exceed twenty-five educators representing the different interests in education, to be appointed by the Secretary of Education, and not to exceed twenty-five persons, not educators, interested in the results of education from the standpoint of the public.

A BILL FOR A DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE

The situation with respect to Federal legislation bearing upon education has been wholly changed by the introduction of a measure, sponsored by the Administration itself, to create a Department of Public Welfare. The measure is known as the Kenyon-Fess Bill, S. 1607 and H. R. 5837. Its principal provisions follow:

1. A Department of Public Welfare with a Secretary in the President's Cabinet and four Assistant Secretaries is created;

2. The Department is to consist of four divisions, each under an Assistant Secretary, as follows:

(a) A Division of Education, which, under the general supervision of the Secretary, shall have charge of the educational functions and activities of the department and shall by investigation, publication, and such other methods as may be authorized by Congress, promote the development of schools and other educational and recreational facilities for the instruction of children and illiterate adults, the training of teachers, and the Americanization of those persons in the United States who lack knowledge of our language or institutions.

(b) A Division of Public Health, to have charge of the health functions and activities of the department, and to promote and protect public health.

(c) A Division of Social Service, to have charge of the social welfare functions and activities of the department.

(d) A Division of Veteran Service, to have charge of the soldiers' and sailors' insurance, compensation, rehabilitation, and pension functions and activities of the department.

3. The following offices are transferred from the departments in which they now are located to the Department of Public Welfare:

The Bureau of War Risk Insurance from the Treasury Department,
The Public Health Service from the Treasury Department,
The Children's Bureau from the Department of Labor,
The Bureau of Education from the Interior Department,
The Bureau of Pensions from the Interior Department,
The Freedmen's Hospital from the Interior Department,
The National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers,
Columbia Institution for the Deaf,
Howard University from the Interior Department,
St. Elizabeth's Hospital from the Interior Department.

4. The following offices are abolished:

Director of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance,
The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service,
The Commissioner of Education,
The chief, assistant chief and private secretary to the chief of the Children's Bureau,
The Federal Board for Vocational Education, and
The Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

The functions of these officers are conferred upon the Secretary of Public Welfare.

5. The President is authorized to transfer to the Department of Public Welfare in addition to the functions, powers, and duties transferred by the bill, any educational, health, or social welfare service or activity performed by the Federal Government.

In addition to this measure, Senator McCormick has also introduced a bill to create a Department of Public Welfare. This bill follows the general lines of Chapter 2 of the measure introduced by him in the last Congress and reported in THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD of January, 1921.

ACTION OF THE COUNCIL

The meeting of the American Council on Education, held May 6 and 7, 1921, had before it the Kenyon-Fess Bill for consideration.

The meeting was also addressed by Brigadier General Charles E. Sawyer, the personal physician of President Harding, who explained the Administration's purpose in framing the measure. General Sawyer's remarks appear on pages 76 to 80 of this issue. The Council devoted some time to the discussion of this measure and finally passed the following resolution:

The American Council on Education has declared itself by referendum in favor of the creation of a Department of Education. It has not endorsed officially any measure now before Congress.

At hearings before the Committees on Education of the House and Senate representatives of the Council appeared with other representatives of educational interests and requested that the provisions for the Division of Education be removed from the Department of Public Welfare bill. The reason given for this request was that the proposed department would be so exclusively concerned with matters relating to veteran relief—many of them highly controversial—that the interests of education, involving as they do a relatively slight expenditure of money, would receive little consideration. Indeed, the prestige of education is damaged rather than enhanced by replacing the Commissioner of Education by an Assistant Secretary of Public Welfare.

A Department of Public Welfare¹

IT MAY interest you to know why a Public Welfare Department is being considered by the Administration at this time.

That you may understand, I will take advantage of this opportunity to give you some underlying facts.

It may interest you to know that the President of the United States, Warren G. Harding, is a man whose family, both of the present and the preceding generation, have been devoted to humanitarian objects. His mother was a devout Christian and spent much of her time in Christianizing efforts. His father has practiced medicine for fifty years, going from house to house, serving the rich and poor alike. He has a sister who spent ten years as a missionary to India; a brother who is a leading alienist in the State of Ohio; a sister who is one of the leading educators of the Buckeye State; and another sister who taught for many years in the State Blind Asylum of Ohio, while he himself has devoted the greater part of his own life to things that have to do with the advancement of the welfare of the American people.

Thus you can see that naturally there arose in his mind the idea of a far-reaching department devoted to such objects.

The President has as his present objective the highest type of American citizenship, measured both physically and mentally. The President has no thought that it is going to be possible for him in his Administration to erect the superstructure he has in mind; but he does feel that it is going to be possible for him to lay the foundation for reaching his objective eventually.

We have considered the subject of Public Welfare from three standpoints. First we believe that to make the best American citizen we must begin with his early education. With this in mind we have made education the corner stone of the public welfare subject. Our purpose in this administration of education is so to arrange the matters affecting education as to bring them together in the most effectual way and to make it possible for education to speak for itself in the strongest way possible and thereby carry out its highest ideals.

¹Portions of an address delivered by Brigadier General Charles E. Sawyer at the annual meeting of the American Council on Education, May 6, 1921.

There is no disposition on the part of the Administration in this bill to destroy individual incentive, to upset any motive there may be in any individual to do the best he can for the advancement of educational standards. There is, however, in this bill, an urgent desire to do everything that is constructive which will be helpful in developing the highest and best standards of education.

We find ourselves at the present time confronted by some opposition by those who think that it is not quite possible to carry out the highest ideals of education, unless they have a separate Department of Education. In this connection I wish to say that a special Department of Education is impossible at this time. With the limited time at my command I cannot discuss with you now the reasons for this decision, but must ask you to accept this as a fact.

I take it that at least some of you voted for Mr. Harding. I take it also that in doing so you expressed your confidence in him and his ability to guide and direct all matters of government well. I hope you still have that same confidence and that you will continue to believe that he will direct these things in as nearly a proper course as possible. Always bear this in mind: the President's only thought is to be constructive, to help benefit and enlarge both the influence and the functions of education in every way possible. After mature consideration we know of no better way to promote the interests of education than to unite education with the affairs of public welfare as we have in this bill.

This bill contemplates giving educators under the division of education absolute control of things educational. At the same time it affords equal chances for your recommending some one who shall take the Cabinet position.

That you may understand the scope of the welfare bill as presented, it may interest you to know of the other matters we contemplate in the Department of Public Welfare. We start with education; next, we unite in the chain of public welfare, public health. We feel sure that no matter what may be accomplished in the matter of education, we still have need for public health. The public health service which we have in mind will have no superior. If we are allowed to do what this bill contemplates we expect to have a public health service that will speak for America wherever America wishes to be spoken for as related to public health service. We know that in the Public Health Service of the United States we now have the best of doctors and medical scientists capable of the best of public health service. Formerly we went abroad for in-

formation that would make us better physically, but we have finally learned that we are teachers rather than students. We know that America is already in the vanguard of public health service. We want our Public Health Service to have no equal. So along with everything else that this Administration has in mind in making this a really great America, it is the intention to enlarge the Public Health Service in this Welfare Department to bring about these ideals.

After considering education and public health, we still found we had another relation as American citizens which expressed itself very poorly in the term of social service. What we have in mind under the title "social service" are the many present existing uplifting enterprises of the country. There are at present functioning in the United States 154 national organizations that are helping to do what they can to uplift and confer the blessings and privileges of American citizenship upon the people of the United States.

It might interest you to know of my own recent experience soon after coming to Washington. A woman came into my office and said: "Dr. Sawyer, I would like very much to serve in some capacity in your Department, I wonder what I can do?" I said, "I have no money with which to pay for any service. Those who come to me must come voluntarily and serve without compensation." And she said, "I am looking for just such a job as that."

A rare thing, I must say, in Washington, but I suggested to her that she might go out and find for me the number and if possible the names and addresses of all uplifting institutions in the city. She came back the next day with the names and addresses of 151 of these societies, boards, charitable associations, leagues, etc., etc.

From this information I decided that there were several principles involved here worthy of careful consideration. One was that there must be a great deal of executive ability employed in these various organizations, else they could not exist. What a vast number of assistants and people must be co-operating whose time perhaps was employed but not directed to as general and as effectual results as possible. One day in visiting one of the smaller institutions of this character, I discovered some of the wealthiest citizens of Washington as participants in the operation of the place. Then it struck me that certainly there was also a large amount of money expended in these various affairs. With 151 of these institutions in Washington there must be much overlapping of effort, inefficiency of operation and withal much of wasteful expenditure.

We therefore endeavored to think out some plan by which these various agencies could be so correlated that all this force could be accumulated to drive in a direct line and out of this we developed the division of social service. I admit that the affairs of social service are the most perplexing things we have met up to this present hour; but we are on the way and being once on the way and with a determination to reach our destination, I feel sure that I can say to you we will ultimately bring the problems to a solution that will be quite satisfactory.

Education, Public Health, Social Service, constitute the first three links in our chain of Public Welfare. After getting to Washington, we found an entirely new subject which war times had developed. We found here our crippled and afflicted soldiers, with their need of rehabilitation. We found also the necessity of giving them some direct and immediate attention such as it seemed they had not been given up to that time, and feeling that these men were entitled to everything that America could give, we at once devoted our best energies to the development of a systematic plan for taking care of them. This resulted in the organization of the Veteran Service Administration, under which the affairs of the World War Veterans are well on the way to settlement. We are delivering assistance every hour to the men who served us and saved us and are entitled to the very best that we can give them. I would have you carry that message back to your constituents and thereby help us to assure the American people and the American soldiers that the present Administration has its machinery in motion and that we are going to remove cause for complaint and overcome most of the difficulties that are presenting in this connection.

After mature consideration we were led to conclude that the Veteran Service Administration was another very important part of our welfare needs and with that understanding we have added the Veteran Service Administration to our chain and have united under the new bill Education, Public Health, Social Service and the Veteran Service Administration.

That you may understand something about how important all of these matters are and how they are related, I would like to state that the affairs it is proposed to assemble in these four divisions of the Department of Public Welfare as expressed last year in money represent an expenditure of \$701,830,000; the engagement of 39,984 employees, with \$41,000,000 expended for salaries alone. When we think of the outlay of close to one billion dollars by the

twenty different bureaus and departments, any business man can see that they are not working as successfully or as effectively as they should. We believe that by bringing them together we are going to do a great deal for economy.

If I may for another moment discuss the present Government relation of education, it seems to me about as far from where it belongs in its present attachment to the Department of the Interior as is the Public Health Service as now attached to the Treasury Department. I never could quite understand why the Public Health Service should be a division of the Treasury Department. I cannot understand why education should be under the direction of the Interior Department. What both should be to place them where they will both have sympathetic relation and harmonious functioning is under the Department of Public Welfare. If you believe in the final objective, if you will have confidence in this Administration, if I can impress upon you the determination of the Administration to raise education to its highest standard, then I am going to ask you to commit yourselves to the idea of this new Department of Public Welfare. I would not have you do it except as you have studied it carefully in every relation. It is open to inspection. We invite investigation because we know that underlying the things that we are attempting here is a principle that you will all ultimately indorse as a sound principle. The plan we have submitted for hitching these things together is in a way only tentative. You can readily understand that the details of the working of this machine and the fitting of the parts together can only be perfected as it goes into action, but once in action you have my full assurance that it will allow for the advancement of education to its highest ideals.

More: This Administration wants to serve education; to provide for education, the relation to the American Government that will bespeak for it credit and recognition not only in the United States but throughout the world.

CHARLES E. SAWYER.

Conference on Methods of College Standardization¹

IT MAY be well for the Chairman of the National Conference Committee on Standards to preface the conference this afternoon by a few words. We have had the privilege of being annexed to the American Council on Education, as joint hosts. Perhaps they are the reception committee, the real hosts, and it may be that we do the pouring.

It is natural that the National Conference Committee should be represented this afternoon, because its work for some fifteen years has been along the lines of standardization, as its name indicates. A few gentlemen, not more than four or five, representative of some of the leading educational associations of this country, got together at Williamstown in a most informal way and started this committee on standards. It has grown steadily in its numbers and in its influence. We have today ten associations represented. We have been busy with many things. I think it would interest you to look over our recent minutes to see how many things this committee has attempted to do, everything from trying to standardize the symbolism of marking to the much more hopeless problem of attempting to standardize the symbolism of honorary degrees.

When I came into the organization some three or four years since the committee had reached what was perhaps the high-water mark of its activities, for it was engaged in the audacious attempt to define a college. This task took two of our annual sessions, with a year's work of an excellent sub-committee between, and I presume most of you have seen the outcome of the work which we did. We were aware, of course, that many other organizations throughout the country were engaged in a similar task, and we quickly became conscious of the fact that the spirit of independence could not be quenched, and that some of our own constituent members were trying their hand at a definition of a college. The result was inevitable. The confusion which we had undertaken vainly to

¹This and the following addresses were delivered at a Conference on the Methods of Standardizing Colleges called jointly by the National Conference Committee on Standards of Colleges and Secondary Schools and the American Council on Education, and held at Washington, May 6, 1921.

clear up was increasing. Something had to be done to bring order out of chaos. This inharmonious situation was irksome to us all, and it was especially exasperating to our distinguished friend, the Director of the Council on Education. He proceeded to adopt the Conference Committee into his own family and very soon to let us have a very congenial task, which was that, as I have said before, of being annexed to the American Council in extending this invitation to you to come here today and tomorrow to consider a question of great importance in our educational system.

Now, what is our purpose here this afternoon and tomorrow? We recognize the importance of defining what we mean by a college, and, based upon that definition, of establishing some method of procedure by which we can translate such a definition into the practical work of making lists inclusive, and by implication exclusive. It is a task of doubtful promise. As I look over this gathering this afternoon, I realize how many varying, almost opposing, interests we represent. Many of you gentlemen come from large institutions, universities in which graduate schools have almost swallowed up the college, and your speaker comes from a college which has fewer students than there are teachers in the University of Michigan. Many of you come from institutions which have a strong and continually increasing vocational tendency. I see a friend of mine down there who comes from a college which still lays stress upon the old-fashioned importance of the academic training. This means that we are bound, by our previous history and experience, to approach the matter of a definition from different angles, and on the face of things, it might seem hopeless to attempt anything of the kind that we have in mind.

And, yet, there are things upon which, of course, we all agree. We believe that every institution of higher education must insist on something at least in the way of requirements for admission; that we must have a certain course of study, issuing in the conferring of degrees authorized legally; that these degrees shall open the way to advanced study in professional schools. We are all agreed that in the faculties of these institutions there must be a minimum number of men of professorial rank, who have had adequate preliminary training. We agree that the number of departments must not be below a certain minimum. We are agreed that laboratories and libraries must be of a character and a range in keeping with the institutions, and we recognize that all this must be of certain market value. We recognize that there must be

adequate endowment in the case of state institutions or adequate governmental support.

On the qualitative side then, we are all pretty much agreed, and it is always well to take comfort from that agreement in a conference. The rock in the current is the "how much"—the quantitative side. What shall this minimum be? There is going to come the difficulty.

Now, it is going to be approached in a pretty logical way. We shall have this afternoon the experience of various associations in defining institutions of higher rank. We are to have a paper on standards of education from the Carnegie Foundation, a paper on the standards of voluntary associations, a paper on the standards of State Departments of Education, and State Universities; on the standards of the Catholic Educational Association; on the standards of the Protestant Church boards. We are, therefore, to have the experience of these very important bodies in our educational system.

Then, we expect to appoint a committee on policy, who are going to do the hard work this evening. It will have to be a matter of give and take. We come here, as I say, inevitably, with certain bias, with certain inevitable prejudices. The spirit of this gathering, and of others that are to follow, must be determined by an intense desire on everyone's part to divest himself, so far as possible, of any preconceived ideas with reference to the subject. We want the experience of men; we want the experience of associations, but all of us must have open minds, so that we may achieve that which is best as the outcome of this meeting.

The attempt may be vain. We may find it impossible, at the end of only two days consideration, to formulate any characterization of a college upon which we can agree, which can be translated, as I have said, into a procedure for making lists. But the very fact that we have attempted to do this thing in the right spirit, even if we should fail, will mark, in my opinion, a very important step in the progress of higher education in this country.

Underlying this problem of formulating a definition, underlying this thought of establishing a procedure for making such a definition practical, underlying all our individual aims and prejudices, there is one idea that is, I am certain, common to all of us. We must make the very best effort we can to elevate the character and standing of the peculiar, the

unique American institution, the college. We must see to it that in any list that is made, by virtue of any definition which we may formulate, whether together or separately, there shall be no place for any institution that is not worthy of the high destiny to which it is called. The American college is really, in a way, a sacred thing.

I remember a number of years ago reading in one of Disraeli's novels that with the passage of the reform bill of 1882, which enfranchised the middle classes, the Horatian period in English parliamentary eloquence came to an end; that up to that time men had been quoting Horace and Virgil, but that with the passage of the bill the government of the country had been taken from this class and put into the hands of less highly educated men. I had the curiosity to look up the Prime Ministers of England from 1832 down to the end of the century and I found that with the exception of Disraeli himself they had been all graduates either of Oxford, Cambridge or Edinborough.

We are a democracy and are becoming more democratic; I can even imagine that the reins of government may in time, to a certain extent, come into the hands of the proletariat. But the time will never come in the history of any country when it can get along without the leadership of its educated men and women.

Underlying everything we may do today and tomorrow or at any subsequent period, there must be the resolve to see to it that the name "college" is untarnished; that every institution that is deserving of the name shall receive the title, and that no institution which is undeserving of the name shall be admitted to any list. We may not be able to make a definition, but if we can attack this problem in a spirit of devotion to the best interests of this institution which is the capstone of our system of liberal education, I think our coming together here will fully justify the idea so nobly conceived and so generously carried out by the American Council on Education.

GEORGE D. OLDS.

Standards in Education

I

Men of experience have been known to express the hope that they are too wise to attempt to define anything. Others, of perhaps equal wisdom, insist that clarity is impossible without definition. The discovery that the word "standards" has fifty shades of meaning, most of them applicable to education, makes at least a glance at them inevitable.

The Latin-French word first appears in English, early in the fourteenth century, applied to the ensign of a military or naval leader as a rallying-point, a conspicuous indication of distinguished success, a guide to conduct, accepted by men as worthy of their ardor and devotion. Soon these symbols and their names were understood as typifying leaders themselves, their followers, and their actuating motives.

We may pass other military uses; but the meanings in ornithology and botany—the longest feathers in the wings of certain birds, and in certain flowers a large petal covering the others—have analogies in education. In arboriculture, standards are new shoots from old stumps, shrubs standing of themselves, not trellised; trees growing their full height, not dwarfed; but also trees brought to a norm by pruning.

Many suggestive meanings are associated with the verb "stand," a candlestick or torch, a support for gearing, a pipe with spouts, the beam of a plow, the ends of church pews, piles in a dam, timbers strengthening the deck and sides of a ship. There are Elizabethan references to "standards round and smooth," to others "colored yellow," and Samuel Pepys wrote "I do resolve upon having the standards of my coach gilt with this new sort of varnish." The word was used also for a suit of clothes, or a set of plumes; for large cases or chests containing household valuables, or tubs for salting meat. The related meaning of constant, permanent or conspicuous is illustrated by "standard subjects like the three R's."

"Standards to mesure bye" is an old and common usage, some authorized exemplar of a unit, like the standard foot in London, or the metre in Paris; hence, also, a legal rate of intrinsic value or

quality, as "the standard and fineness that are called Sterling or Tower Standard," or "the lower standard is used in manufacture . . . the higher standard is never used."

A size, weight, or amount conforming to a uniform or normal measure, is perhaps the commonest meaning, as of the gauge of railways, "standard" money, or rate of wages. Hence, also, the abstract meaning of a recognized example of a definite degree of any quality, as "Horace is the standard of lyric, Virgil of epic poetry." Boyle wrote, "Men will be ashamed to be unlike those whose customs and deportment pass for the standards"; Mrs. Piozzi, "Let us learn better than to set up self as a standard to which all others must be reduced." Here is suggestion as to the establishment of standards from experience and observation, by esteem continued through generations, by a consensus of experts, through mere insistence; and as to recognition based upon the acceptance of authority, or tradition, or upon mere group conformity.

Any value may be used as a means for comparing and judging others; "standard of living" indicates a definite minimum, or a desirable adequacy; "standard of perfection" an ideal that is considered scarcely possible of attainment. Statements of religious creeds have often been called "original and permanent standards of right and wrong." But even they change. Lord Bryce pointed out, in "The American Commonwealth," that criteria may have national limits of applicability. "The English reader must be cautioned against applying his English standards to the examination of the American system."

Of the two chief meanings of the word "standardize," education endeavors to make the most of the one, "to test by comparison with some recognized example," and to avoid the disadvantages of the other, "to make uniform."

II

Following these suggestions, most of which are implicit in the use of the word today, we mean by "standards in education" both ideals and things that embody ideals, both as they are in themselves that give "a body to opinion and a permanence to belief," and also as measures for other things. They represent, in short, the tested results of experience and judgment; simplified into formulas, that become a sound basis for habit and thus release attention for further advances. The adoption and administration of such influ-

ences upon intellectual life might well require all knowledge and all wisdom: for they may easily be made too high to be generally intelligible, too narrow to be influential, too broad to be elevating; or they may be so made and administered as to be wholesome, stimulating, and inspiring.

The establishment of school and college standards has always been intrusted primarily to individual faculties. These academic legislatures, however, have not often met this responsibility by a clear formulation of educational convictions and aims and a definite outline of procedure for attaining them. Most frequently they have been content to adopt already established traditions. Yale and Princeton borrowed their original curriculum from Harvard, which borrowed it from Oxford and Cambridge. Later, many institutions imitated the graduate work of Johns Hopkins, which was imitated from that in Germany. More recently, the "combined course" of collegiate and professional work, inaugurated by Columbia, the four-quarter academic year, inaugurated by the University of Chicago, and the method of teaching engineering in co-operation with the industries, inaugurated by the University of Cincinnati, have been followed by many institutions.

The heritage of the ages and the testimony of tradition are, of course, priceless. The significance of the present and the hope of the future depend upon the past. The experienced mind is conservative. "Custom is the nurse of mankind." Mere imitation, however, whether it follows the merely old or the merely new, destroys individualism and develops mediocrity.

The teacher's task is to distill the past, of which the student can have no experience, so as to prepare him for the future, which the teacher will never see. Although time is wiser than any man, each child begins a new era, and nothing is more vital than life. Avoiding equally the slavery of convention and the despotism of whim, education seeks to influence spontaneous evolution by orderly design, to develop disciplined freedom.

We may not, however, forget that experiment is necessarily crude, that the conspicuous, however immature, is disproportionately influential, that even sound ideas appear to acquire exaggeration in the process of securing attention. Their adoption without test and adjustment leads to over-emphasis and later reaction. Specialization without a general background means narrowness. President Eliot's unlimited electives and Professor Dewey's related doctrine of self-activity were accepted and elevated the judgment of

the student almost above that of the teacher, before institutions retracted their acceptance to retaining only such parts of these doctrines as were assimilable into our general system and rejecting such as were inapplicable and might have been rejected at the outset, by discrimination, without waste of time.

The wise solution of many problems requires a breadth and detachment that cannot be expected from every faculty, perhaps not always from any. What education makes for the best citizenship? What is the proper adjustment between the academic and the vocational, the college and the professional school? What should be the attitude toward research? Should State universities emphasize science and urban universities history? What can be done with a church college for which a denomination provides inadequate support? Should the graduates of every State-approved high school be considered ready for college? How can college requirements for admission be firm without unduly restricting the secondary school? How can the school curriculum be free without weakening the college? To aid in answering such questions, State departments of education; State, regional, national, and international associations have come to co-operate with faculties in the definition and promotion of standards.

The statement of standards requires more than the customary care. School and college catalogues expansively add new statements and retain unmodified those already in position, until the whole becomes a conglomeration of inaccuracies and conflicts. Those who know the facts forget or ignore these discrepancies, but they have earned for educational advertising a reputation that is not enviable. It is, of course, the embodiment of standards in practice that is effective, but the custom of printing statements that do not correspond to current practice misleads both students and patrons, and subjects institutions to imputations of bad faith.

The enforcement of standards, originally carried on by faculties themselves, or their committees, has come more and more to be entrusted to expert administrators. Ideally, such administration should be sincere, sympathetic, and reasonable. Usually it is both devoted and self-sacrificing. "Marvel not," says an old writer, "if the standard-bearer be most struck at." But there are conspicuous instances in which it is extremely rigid or perfunctory, or even deliberately evasive. Administration that is "too good for human nature's daily food" can deprive any standard of vitality. Negligent administration indoctrinates the student in dishonesty, by

demonstrating that the college does not intend to practice what it preaches and that he is not expected to perform what he promises. The characteristic volubility of education is perhaps responsible for its being peculiarly beset by the discrepancy between profession and fulfillment. Frequently only inspection from without makes clear an institution's actual practice in such matters.

Such inspection often performs invaluable service in pointing out obvious errors, indicating easily attainable improvements, and in giving recognition to the superiority of modest requirements sincerely enforced over lofty requirements consistently evaded. But there are still many institutions which consider it surprising that soundness in requirements and soundness in their application should actually increase repute, attendance, and prosperity. Educational surveys, educational associations, organizations of alumni, and the educational foundations have all been influential here, in making known the fact that their recognition and support are available only for institutions that genuinely meet generally recognized standards.

The United States Bureau of Education, a score of State departments of education, and perhaps two score educational associations have come to be earnestly engaged in the promotion of standards. The judgments and recommendations of a dozen or a score of these have been collected from time to time by the National Conference Committee on Standards, the Council of Church Boards of Education, and the American Council on Education. It now seems possible to bring about an even more general co-operation.

III

Further clarification will probably result in greater agreement concerning standards in many matters.

Fifteen units of secondary school work has become the prevailing requirement for college entrance. Appropriate organizations have been assiduous in outlining the scope of the various school subjects. The quantitative definition of a unit as one-fourth of a school year, however, is not yet universal; some States and some institutions use instead the interpretation of that definition in minimum recitations for at least so many days and weeks, and thus credit high school courses with twenty units or five-fourths in every year. Institutional and regional preferences with regard to specific subjects, and prescribed, elective, and free units, require

more general understanding. Comprehensive and psychological examinations and much fuller personal records are contributing new data to the perennial comparison between certificates and examinations. Entrance to college with conditions grows ever more troublesome—weakening requirements, burdening students, confusing records, and annoying faculties. The experience of those colleges that have abolished conditions altogether should be helpful to others. The generally commended separation between college and preparatory work is brought again into question by the rise of the junior college.

Statistics of enrollment are still usually based upon aggregate registration, rather than upon the considerably smaller number of students actually in attendance. There is no agreement as to the method of counting part-time students or teachers. These factors seriously affect any comparison between institutions, or any estimates of institutional, departmental, or per capita costs.

Soundness in college accounting and business methods is increasingly insisted upon by those who provide money for education, but any intimate relation between a program of studies and the resources available for it is still unusual.

The Association of American Colleges is endeavoring to formulate a curriculum that shall be liberal, include advanced work, and allow reasonable freedom. The Association of American Universities is endeavoring to indicate what a college should do to prepare its students for graduate work. The college curriculum and the question of degrees appear, therefore, to be receiving adequate attention, but it is certain that all suggestions will be gratefully received.

The length of the college year, the number of departments, and the number of full-time teachers, are measures so simple and convenient that they need to be used with caution until we are more certain concerning just what these measures represent in actual quality of instruction.

The demand for well-trained teachers is perhaps better established than the supply, the question of salaries has been adequately formulated, and studies have been made of the number of classes a teacher should be expected to undertake. Recent developments in tests and marking systems are suggestive, but their relation to good teaching is still obscure.

There is need for further agreement as to the irreducible minimum of endowment that is essential for an effective college, espe-

cially for those institutions in which subsistence is counted as compensation. The proportion of income that is spent for instruction requires further definition, especially in State institutions.

It would be happy if some expert body, like the American Library Association, would indicate the essentials of an adequate college library, and if similar learned organizations would indicate the essentials of laboratories for the various subjects. Until then local valuations and appropriations for development and maintenance give but limited information.

Standards of physical education are beginning to emerge, but student housing and health, government and recreation, still remain in the realm of individual rather than comparable endeavor.

Annual or biennial published reports of essential activities are increasing in number sufficiently to furnish material for suggestive studies.

Any or all of these, and sundry similar matters, may well receive attention, not as mere detail, but as sensible expressions of principles and ideals. Details uninspired by ideals are of little worth; ideals unexpressed in details are ineffective.

For, finally, the public must be helped to understand and approve sound educational standards before permanent support can be secured for them. The impulsive vigor of our time, so successful in material matters, feels the abstract to be alien and conformity to any set standard unpleasantly restrictive. But the indulgence of uncontrolled vitality soon leads to extravagance and caprice. Novelty has no relation to value; variety itself grows tiresome. Sooner or later experience proves that irresponsible aggressiveness, however sincere, is not fruitful, that mere recalcitrance against the established is not progress, that free speech alone leads nowhere, that evolution is safer than revolution, that democracy demands agreement and co-operation. Then every contact with serious knowledge, sweet reasonableness, cultivated taste, and solid accomplishment inspires respect. The eternal verities are unshaken; they require only faithful interpretation to compel the reverence of the world.

CLYDE FURST.

The Present Standards of Voluntary Associations

PRESENT standards of voluntary associations have a much wider range than is seen at first on the surface. The appearance and growth of voluntary associations for defining and applying standards for colleges came about from the lack of any authoritative national or sectional agency for prescribing or enforcing standards. With the exception of the regents of the University of the State of New York, there was until about ten years ago practically no body, national or state, that had any real authority to define or enforce a standard for a college in the admission of students or in the granting of degrees. The years since then have seen some improvement, but it is still true that the main function of State departments of education with respect to colleges is that of regulating the charters for colleges and receiving annual reports, which are more or less significant. Indeed, when one observes the ease with which chartered institutions comply with the law he realizes that this country is still very far from any danger of supervision of higher education by the State or National Government.

The growth of the tendency to intermigration of students among colleges and universities, both as undergraduates and as graduates, accentuated the differences of standards particularly when the State universities developed graduate schools and professional schools requiring a certain amount of college training for admission. The need for accurate information as to standards and organizations within the State and in neighboring States gave new significance to any scheme for coordinating the standards of higher institutions within a given area. It was in response to demands from the larger institutions, and especially those having graduate and professional schools which received students from very wide areas, that the Association of American Universities and the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools entered upon the present program of defining, elaborating and applying standards for colleges and universities.

In this undertaking the North Central Association followed

more or less the methods and organization concerned primarily with the standardizing of secondary schools for purposes of granting accrediting privileges in connection with college entrance. The development of the credit system, State by State, after several experiments, has become so universal that even the advocates of examination as the sole basis for admission have pretty much surrendered.

As a preliminary to this movement the United States Bureau of Education, through its then newly established division of higher education, prepared in 1911 a tentative list of institutions grouped according to certain announced criteria, and issued a preliminary statement of the classification. (It is to be noted that this was a voluntary association of one.) This was done mainly in response to a definite request from the deans of graduate schools in the Association of American Universities. The printing of the list was in the form of a sort of proof sheet in an edition of about 300 which was intended to be preliminary to a fuller and more accurate list. The revised edition, however, never got beyond the galley proof stage in 1913.

About this time, 1913, the Association of American Universities, which is a voluntary association not primarily organized for the purpose of standardizing and accrediting, adopted a special report and resolution regarding the recognition of bachelor's degrees of American colleges and universities. It approved and adopted the accepted list of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. This list included 129 institutions, twenty-two being members of the Association. One of the objects of this adoption of a list by the Association of American Universities was to secure for a larger group of institutions, whose standards for the bachelor's degree were approximately those of the institutions which were members of the Association, the same foreign recognition for their graduates as the membership of the Association enjoyed through the action of the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Berlin and other foreign institutions and education offices in 1905 and succeeding years.

The resolution adopted by the Association of American Universities reads as follows:

Resolved, That this Association recommend to the Prussian Kultusministerium and the corresponding ministeries of the other German states that, for the present, there be recognized as the equivalent of the German *Maturitätszeugnis* not only the bachelor's

degrees conferred by the members of this Association, but also the degrees of those other American colleges and universities which are on the accepted list of the Carnegie Foundation or which are certified by this Foundation as of equivalent standing but excluded from its accepted list for other than educational reasons. For the information of the authorities concerned a list of these colleges and universities is here appended.

And then follows the list of 1913. Obviously the privileges conferred by this resolution were very real and constituted a much desired recognition abroad and in other quarters. Consequently, certain institutions which were not on the list at its adoption, but who believed they were equally entitled to recognition with those on the list, began to make application to the Association for inclusion in this list. It was a perfectly proper request. The Association felt at once that it must meet such requests. It asked the Carnegie Foundation to keep its list up to date and to inform the Association of such changes. Again, very properly, the Foundation declined to do it, and the burden of enlarging the list of 1913 in accordance with such standards as it should see fit to establish was placed upon the Association.

It created a committee on classification of colleges, which again, you see, was purely a voluntary act of a voluntary Association, and carried with it no actual authority over any institution. This committee began its operations and defined officially certain groups of institutions which it believed might be included in the accepted list. In doing this it did not set up positive exact minimum standards which should be complied with, and it has never done so. It undertook to determine the addition of institutions from time to time upon the principles set out in these three statements of 1914. These were approved by the Association and were not merely the work of the committee.

Group A—Institutions whose graduates should ordinarily be admitted to the graduate schools of this Association for work in lines for which they have had adequate undergraduate preparation, with a reasonable presumption that advanced degrees may be taken with the minimum amount of prescribed work and in the minimum time prescribed. Students who choose work in lines for which their undergraduate work has not prepared them adequately must expect to take more time and do additional work.

Group B—Institutions from which only those graduates of high standing in their classes who are individually recommended by the department of undergraduate instruction corresponding to

that in which they purpose to do their graduate work may be admitted on the same basis as graduates from the institutions of Group A.

Group C—Other institutions whose graduates should be admitted to graduate schools, but with the presumption that more than the minimum time and the minimum amount of work will be ordinarily required for an advanced degree.

The pressure upon the Association, operating under this general statement, became rather acute from several groups of institutions, and the committee had a very large correspondence and carried on a good deal of investigation of its own. This pressure came chiefly indirectly from the Association of Collegiate Alumnae. In 1915, that body, which, by the way, is to be included in the voluntary standardizing associations, adopted a resolution that no institution which was not in Class 1 of the list of the United States Bureau of Education, should be eligible for membership. Well, that ceased to be a valid list. Of course, it was tentative only, and ought never to have been adopted by the Collegiate Alumnae. They were warned they should not do it, but they rushed in even where the Bureau of Education feared to tread. As a consequence they were soon forced to adopt another basis, namely, the list of the Association of American Universities, which they should not have done, because it was not specifically and specially adapted to their purposes. But immediately all the institutions which graduate considerable numbers of women began to bombard the committee, and the bombardment still continues.

The Association of American Universities has from time to time had to enlarge its list, after such examination as it could make. It added in 1917 eighteen to the list; in 1918, two; in 1919, three; and in 1920, eight; making a total of thirty-one.

The standards of the Association of American Universities have been read to you. The Association, as I understand the matter, is concerned much more with the quality of the product as it comes into the market of the graduate schools especially, or of institutions preparing for the "foreign export trade," than it is with the measuring of endowment and registration and all the mechanical paraphernalia of the ordinary standardizing agency. Now, this Association so far has steadily refused to define in more exact terms than those above stated the standards which it should apply. And yet, there is a certain value in that, because

the institutions which apply come up before a jury, sometimes two or three times, before they are successfully accepted. That jury sits upon the matter very much as the jury of the Salon sits upon the admission of the work of an artist. They try to judge the artist on his products. And so here, if there are not enough samples the college does not get in; an institution which comes up for action without, in recent years, having sent anybody into any reputable graduate school is certain to be rejected. The application of the standard in such a case as this is fairly simple, because if an institution has not driving power enough to send its students on into graduate or professional courses, based upon college work, there must be something wrong with it. It is up to the institution to prove its case.

A specific example will illustrate. One institution in the Rocky Mountain country has been knocking every year for admission. It has an elaborate organization of something over fifteen separate departments. It has a considerable body of students, but when this test was applied, it was quite clear that such reputation as it had for preparing for graduate work was dependent upon a single department and had been through all the years. No other department had sent any considerable number of students of distinction into graduate work, and so the material presented by the college sifted itself down, according to this standard, to the work of one professor who had a remarkable driving power.

The application of this new standard is worth mentioning, it seems to me, at this time, because we are so much concerned in other places with exact compliance with the minimum requirements. And it should also be said in this connection that in applying this standard the Association has expressed its determination to review its present list in view of the post-war conditions, to see whether those which have been accepted are worthy of continuance.

The second group of these voluntary associations may be typified by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

The sheets which are in your hands will show the various standards that are applied by these various sectional associations. Consequently I shall omit a detailed description of all of these. But the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, being the oldest and in some respects the most vigorous of these organizations, has served as a model for other sectional

associations in organizing the work of accrediting higher institutions.

The North Central Association is something like Lord Roberts in Kipling's poem, who had "been at it forty years, amassin' souveneers in the way o' slugs an' spears," as it has been at it for thirty years, so far as secondary education is concerned. About eight years ago it undertook the task of accrediting colleges, in the same general manner in which the secondary schools were accredited. While the Association was rather slow in getting started, under the very energetic direction of Professor Charles H. Judd, of the University of Chicago, the matter was brought into the ken of the Association, and the work began in earnest. In the years since 1913, the Association has tried to prepare, from time to time, additions to a list of accredited institutions of higher education in the North Central area. In the beginning a good many of these institutions were members of the Association, and they were continued as members of the Association. Then came the problem of applying standards to applicants for admission, and in this process of applying the standards, it seems to me one might almost say there is another standard involved, because applying standards by a certain rule of minima is a clerical matter. If standards are to be vitalized, something more than mere clerical routine is necessary. About 1916 the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education decided it would add personal inspection of institutions which applied for accrediting to the ordinary clerical review of material submitted. In that year the Association added, as it were, another requirement to the standard through forming a judgment by inspection. A board of inspection was created and an endeavor was made to give it such unity, uniformity of ideas and permanence as would insure respect for its judgment. This board has operated since then and has made a considerable number of inspections year by year.

To illustrate how this personal standard has been enforced, in 1919, 22 inspections were made; in 1920, 12 inspections, and in 1921, 17 inspections. On the basis of this inspection institutions have been accredited; and institutions have been rejected. Institutions have been warned by the Association, visited by an inspector, and several of them have been dropped by the Association. This inspection is not a survey; an inspection of two days, or one day, of course, cannot be a survey. It is not, therefore, a real, exact diagnosis of the present and future of the institution,

with a prescription as to what it should do to increase its strength or maintain its existence. It is a review, on the ground, of things as they seem to be, tested by the sympathetic and at the same time critical judgment of an experienced man.

A second characteristic of the standards in the North Central Association should be mentioned. It was very early found that there were three sorts of schools, all entitled to recognition of some sort as higher institutions. At first these were all lumped together in one list of higher institutions—standard colleges and universities, junior colleges, and teacher training institutions. Then began, about four years ago, a differentiation and the establishment of three sets of standards by the Association. The one of 1913, for colleges, has been maintained substantially as it was. A new one has been devised after an elaborate inquiry, to be applied to the teacher training institutions, and this set of standards for such institutions has been in force for three years. In addition there is a third set of standards for junior colleges, so the North Central Association has three sets of standards which, through its Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, it is endeavoring to apply.

In this group of associations should be included the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States, as well as one for the Middle States and Maryland, and one for New England. Some of these have other standards, in some respects, than the North Central Association. Some of them have, for example, endeavored to prescribe minimum salaries for the faculty and other features which the North Central Association has not taken up.

Along with these associations we should mention as very definitely reenforcing as a voluntary association the work of the other accrediting agencies, the Council on Medical Education, or, as it is now known, the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals. This is concerned with college work because medical schools admit students who have had two years of college work. The Council has adopted a list composed of the lists of these various sectional associations, and thus reinforces all the announced standards of these associations. To assist the purposes of the Council the North Central Association has begun a definite inquiry into all the prescribed pre-medical subjects in the college course to see how they have measured up to the standards announced by the Medical Association.

There are two or three other associations which are entitled to mention. One is the Association of Collegiate Alumnae, of which I have already spoken, which is doing excellent work, with special emphasis upon the treatment and recognition of women. The Southern Association of College Women is another vigorous association. I think anybody who has known anything about the Southern Association must be familiar with the excellent work of Miss Elizabeth A. Colton. She should be singled out for special mention for her really admirable sustained efforts to enforce a high standard.

There are also groups of educational associations or college associations in the different States, which are more or less negligible quantities, it must be said, when it comes to the matter of announcing standards or enforcing standards. For example, one association of colleges has a statement that its standards are A, B and C, provided they are not altered by the executive committee. We cannot get very far in that way in the work of standardizing.

So, in the States of Alabama, Illinois, Kentucky, Missouri, New York, Ohio, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia and Wisconsin there are local college associations. Some of them have given valuable support to various enterprises relating to colleges. A few carry on a certain amount of standardizing. But in a broad way it may be said that standardizing is more likely to be done by the sectional than by the State associations.

Speaking for at least two of the prominent voluntary associations, it seems extremely desirable that some further unity should be established. In this connection a special plea should be made for the element of inspection by some person whose judgment may be trusted by the general agency. So far as the North Central Association can claim any large significance for its work, it lies in the development of a systematic and rather firm inspection of the institutions which apply for accrediting, for annually it rejects more than it approves.

KENDRIC C. BABCOCK.

Present Standards of State Departments of Education and State Universities

THE fact that a representative of the Federal Government has been asked to speak about something which primarily concerns state governments illustrates the fact that the Federal Government does not control education. However, there are a great many people in this country who apparently indulge in that assumption. Hardly a day passes that the Division of Higher Education at the Bureau of Education does not receive an inquiry from someone who desires to know whether such and such an institution is a standard college or not. For instance, not so very long ago, I sent out a circular letter asking the state departments of education and the state universities to tell me what they were doing in this field. One of the state departments of education replied that it was attempting to enforce the standards established by the Bureau of Education. I have not ascertained yet which standards were referred to.

The individual states have to a considerable extent regulated elementary and secondary education, a situation which has resulted in a great amount of coordination of effort. In the realm of higher education, however, state governments have not, until recently, done very much. The state laws for the incorporation of higher institutions are for the most part very unsatisfactory. In some instances the state law establishes certain standards as in Pennsylvania where an institution of higher learning is required to have assets of \$500,000 before it may be incorporated.

In recent years, however, state departments of education have done something in the direction of standardization. They have done it somewhat cautiously and largely because they have been confronted with the concrete question of deciding what institutions within the state should be allowed the privilege of having their graduates certified to teach in the secondary schools. It has become a fairly common prac-

tice for the state departments of education to make up a list of institutions whose graduates may have privileges of this sort. One finds usually, in connection with the standards which have been established by the State Department of Education, a provision that such graduates must have a certain amount of work in educational courses before they may be allowed to teach in the secondary schools of the State. This is a requirement not found in standards set by other agencies.

The state universities have also a specific object in view, namely, to select those institutions within their respective states which they regard as giving a course of study comparable in quality to that which they themselves give. Other institutions are approved or not, as they approximate in excellence the work of the accrediting university.

The state departments of education have been much more active than the state universities. There are perhaps as many as twenty state departments which have very definite standards for the institutions of higher learning within their borders, although possibly not more than fifteen have outlined these standards in any considerable detail. You may be interested to note how similar the standards of state departments are. You will find them on the second sheet of the tabular statement, copies of which have been distributed. They are, beginning with the east, the standards of the state departments of New York, Maryland, Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, South Dakota, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, California, Washington and Oregon.¹

As you are aware, sometimes institutions of higher learning within a state are not willing to turn over the matter of accrediting colleges and universities to the state department of education. Neither are they altogether willing to turn over the matter to the state universities, and so, as has been mentioned here this afternoon, one finds in a number of states associations of colleges and universities. I think the general indictment leveled at them a few moments ago is perhaps entirely just. However, there are one or two of these associations that are very active. I am thinking particularly of the association in Texas. Personally, I believe that the state organizations, although not of any considerable consequence at

¹At this point Dr. Zook exhibited certain tabulations prepared by the Bureau of Education.

present, are likely to be of more importance as time goes on, because they solve, in a fairly satisfactory way, that difference of opinion which exists as to whether the state universities or the state department of education should exercise the privilege of standardizing.

There are certain other cooperative agencies which have already been referred to. In Iowa, there is a commission representing the three state institutions which engage in standardizing colleges. A similar situation exists in Florida, where the state superintendent, the state high school inspector, and the Dean of the University of Florida accredit institutions of higher learning.

In preparing the tabular statements which I have placed in your hands certain things came to my attention, especially with reference to the state departments of education and the state universities. It was quite apparent that the state departments of education have not been leaders in this movement. They have in a great many instances—perhaps in at least one-half of the instances—taken the standards already established by some other organization. For instance, the standards of the state departments of Iowa, Washington, Oregon and South Dakota, are all quite consciously adapted with only slight changes from standards which were established at a meeting of representatives of northern and western states in Salt Lake City in 1910. The State Department of West Virginia states that in its work it is using the standards of the North Central Association. The University of Minnesota and certain other institutions are also consciously using the standards of the North Central Association. In some of the southern states, for example in Arkansas, the state departments have accepted the standards of the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States.

I understand that the Association of Tennessee Colleges has recently accepted the standards of the Southern Association.

The North Central Association has seen fit to establish standards for other types of institutions than the four year college; the Southern Association also. They have defined junior colleges and teachers' colleges. State departments of education have also done something toward establishing standards for the normal schools within their states. Certain

states, as, for instance, Maine, supervise the work of the normal schools, but have not undertaken to pronounce on the four year colleges.

I cannot, of course, predict what the attitude of the state departments of education and the state universities will be in connection with the problem we have before us here today, except that it seems to me what has taken place indicates that the state departments are looking for leadership with respect to a generally accepted definition of the colleges of liberal arts and sciences. I believe, therefore, that the state departments of education will be very willing to consider favorably whatever action this body takes. I do not think, however, that we can expect to invade at once the legal functions of the state departments of education and the state universities with respect to carrying out those standards. After all, one must realize that the state governments control education. In certain instances, at least, definitions of standards have been written into the laws in such a way that it would be very difficult to change them. I am convinced, however, that the state departments of education and state universities will be willing to consider favorably the adoption of such uniform standards as we may at this meeting, or ultimately, be able to agree to.

GEORGE F. ZOOK.

Present Standards of the Catholic Educational Association

In one sense it is unnecessary to occupy the time of the Council with a special statement regarding the Catholic Educational Association. The whole trend of the work done by that Association has been largely influenced by what has been done in other organizations and by other standardizing agencies.

We may, however, point out three different phases in the history of Catholic colleges and secondary schools. The first phase was one in which the word "standard" was unknown in the sense in which we are now taking it, that is, a generally accepted norm which every institution had to follow. Each college had its own ideas about entrance requirements, curriculum and graduation. I suppose it was the same in the other colleges of the country. I might add, in regard to Catholic institutions, that they are conducted, for the most part, by religious orders, each of which has traditions of its own, some of them reaching very far back into the past; and there has been an honest endeavor on their part to accommodate themselves to the changing environment of our country.

In the second phase some attempt was made to standardize by accepting the standards set by other agencies. The American Council's report on accredited higher institutions shows that Catholic colleges are to be found in various states in the Union, and are accredited on some one or the other of the plans which are presented in the report.

Then comes the third phase, in which the Catholic Educational Association took hold of the problem and decided to add one more standard to those already existing. That was in 1911, and during the past ten years the Association, at its annual meetings, has studied this subject with results that are not far different from those given by the other organizations. There is a difference of a unit or so in regard to this or that requirement.

In line with what has already been said, it may be proper to point out certain characteristics of our institutions. There

are 114 Catholic colleges in this country, and of these the requirements set up by the Association have been met by 59 colleges, 42 for men and 17 for women. Back of these requirements are certain ideas which are characteristic of the work of the Association. In the first place, the Catholic colleges have not been very strongly in favor of what might be called the wide-open elective system. They have followed out the idea that the student coming up from the high school to the college needs to be informed about the fields of education that lie beyond him. He does not know as yet all that there is to be known; he has not had a wide experience when he leaves the high school and possibly he might be helped by the judgment of men who are older and presumably wiser than he. But on the other hand there has been a gradual relaxation from the prescribed course that was prevalent in our colleges, say, forty years ago. The present condition might be described as a gradual or progressive electivism. The freshman course is prescribed, and then as the judgment of the student improves, he is allowed a wider range of choice, so that in the senior year his course is practically elective in all subjects.

Another thing we have found is this: You cannot standardize a college by itself. It is the old relation, of course, between college and high school. Before we had gone very far we found that if we were going to set up college standards, we had to carry that work backward and downward and standardize the high school. That work is now in progress in the Association.

There is also the idea, rather widely accepted among the members of the Association, that in the question of quality versus quantity, quality ought to win out. Of course, we must have something in the quantitative line. But the essential thing is the quality of the work that is done, and we are now discussing in the Association the sort of qualitative standards that will prove most useful. We shall not, of course, set aside the quantitative altogether; that would be impossible. But there does seem to be, from our point of view, a little too much emphasis today on units and points, so that the whole ambition of the student is to get just the number of units required. I fear that if we continue on that line we shall not do very much for the improvement of either college or high school.

There is one other point to which attention is now being given in the Association. Let us suppose that our standards, quantitative or qualitative, or both, are adopted. Who is to put these standards in operation? It will not be done by the catalogue, although that is very often the responsible spokesman, as was said a while ago. The standards, if they are to be worth anything, are not merely something to be spread upon the catalogue; they have to get down to the life of the college. That means that they have to be put in operation by the teachers. If we have teachers who are properly trained many of these minor points that we are discussing today—questions about units, subjects in the curriculum, and so on, will solve themselves.

Our Association just now is spending more time on this problem of the preparation of teachers and a standard of teacher training than anything else. We hope in that way to bring our own institutions up to a desirable level, and at the same time to co-operate in our own measure with the work of all the colleges of the country, together with the high schools and the junior colleges. I should say, then, summing it up, that the standards of the Catholic Educational Association are now fairly established, but subject to modification, which will be made both in view of what is done here by the American Council, and in view of the needs as recognized in our own institutions.

EDWARD A. PACE.

Present Standards of Protestant Church Boards of Education

HERE are about twenty national boards of Protestant education, and these twenty boards have, under their more or less immediate jurisdiction, half of the institutions of higher learning in the United States, a list of about 335 to 340 colleges. Of these twenty boards only five are now at work in the field of standardization. These five are the Methodist-Episcopal Board, the Methodist-Episcopal Board South, the Presbyterian Board, the Presbyterian Board South, and the Board of the United Brethren in Christ.

The standards of the Presbyterian Board have been determined largely by the standards adopted by such organizations as the North Central Association, while in the same way the Methodists South have been greatly influenced by the standards of the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States. As indicating a tendency to observe those standards, at its annual meeting in 1920 the Presbyterian Educational Association, South, adopted the standards of the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States, and provided that these standards should go into effect in September, 1922.

The Board of the Northern Baptist Convention followed the principles of the North Central Association in classifying all schools. Several of the other boards, notably the Board of Southern Baptist Convention, which has recently been organized, have announced that they are making plans to enter the field of standardization.

The Boards which do not participate in the work, or do not plan to do so, prefer to have the educational standardization of their institutions done by the national or sectional standardizing agencies, or have felt it unwise to set up machinery for the work because of the small number of their institutions, or their lack of real jurisdiction.

The Board of Education of the Methodist Episcopal Church was the first Protestant Board to enter the field of standardization, the work having been begun thirty years ago. The Board of the

Methodist Episcopal Church South began their work about two years later. The Presbyterians, South, entered this field about ten years ago, while the College Board of the Presbyterian Church of the United States, North, took their first step in this direction in 1912. The United Brethren in Christ began their work in 1914.

It is interesting to observe that in some instances, indeed in most instances, the Board of Education as such does not fix the standards. The discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, provides for a Commission on Education composed of ten practical educators whose duty it is to fix the standards of the different grades of institutions. The Board as a whole classifies the institutions in conformity with these standards.

In the case of the Methodist Episcopal Church this work is done by the University Senate, which is composed of twenty-one persons actively engaged in the work of education, one from each General Conference district and six members at large. The nominations are made by the Bishops. The Board of Education administers the standards set by the University Senate.

The Board of the Presbyterian Church, South, conducts its standardization work in consultation with the Presbyterian Education Association of the South, the division of functions being essentially that prevailing in the two Methodist churches.

The general policy of all these Protestant standardization agencies has been to encourage and stimulate the weaker institutions with the hope that they may reach higher standards. At the same time, it has been felt that in the meantime the weaker institutions should not be utterly neglected and therefore different grades of institutions have been determined. By this means the Methodists, South, to take a single illustration, have built up a large class of junior colleges, the most of which a few years ago were unclassified, each going its own way, and of course not known then as junior colleges but aspiring or professing to be standard colleges. This board also rates institutions as universities, colleges, academies and theological schools. In spite of the sympathetic attitude which these agencies have usually taken toward the weaker schools, fear has been expressed that sometimes excessive standards have been determined by representatives of the older and stronger institutions who did not understand what would be a reasonable requirement for pioneer schools.

The standards of the Presbyterian, South, are reviewed an-

nually by their educational association. The University Senate of the M. E. Church usually modifies some of the requirements of their institutions at each meeting, which in practice is at least once in two years, sometimes oftener. The Commission on Education of the Methodists, South, seldom meets oftener than once a quadrennium, while the Presbyterian standards have not been changed since 1914.

In view of the fact that the standards of the leading church boards have been included in the list, I will not take time with them.¹

There is one point which I wish to read. I quote now from Presbyterian authorities.

"We do not deem it essential to require as large an endowment for two reasons: a. Our churches contribute annually to assist in the support of Presbyterian colleges. These gifts produce approximately \$100,000 a year. b. Teachers in Presbyterian colleges are in a large measure influenced by the missionary spirit and, like all other missionaries, are willing to work on smaller salaries than are demanded in State and independent institutions."

As indicating something of the method by which these boards operate, may I quote from the last report of the Commission on Education of the Methodist-Episcopal Church, South. Here are some things they propose:

"The requirements for women's colleges are brought up to those of the men's colleges." Of course, that is a significant thing when you take that section of the country into consideration.

"In order to keep abreast of the best educational thought and practice of this section the Commission makes it possible for the Board of Education to advance the admission requirements from 14 to 15 units if other important educational associations take like action during the present quadrennium." I am advised that action was taken by the Methodist Board, South, because the Southern Association had not yet taken it, and they led the Association and possibly stimulated the Association to take it.

"The requirement in English is that recommended by the National Conference on Uniform Entrance Requirements in English."

"An institution to be classified as a university shall have a

¹ Reference is here made to the tabulations prepared by the Bureau of Education.

productive endowment of not less than two million dollars or an assured annual income of one hundred thousand dollars and shall be organized on a basis of professional schools and graduate schools, with departments of original research."

I wish to call particular attention to an action which was taken by the University Senate of the Methodist Episcopal Church as showing the attitude of that organization and indicating a certain standard which is higher, in so far as has been brought out in this conference, than any other standard ever set by a sectional standardizing agency in this country:¹

"The minimum endowment of standard colleges shall be raised from \$200,000 to \$300,000, becoming effective June 30, 1922; and that a minimum productive endowment of \$500,000 be required, becoming effective June 30, 1923." Dr. Zook called attention to the fact that the State of Pennsylvania required \$500,000 assets of institutions, but that figure included the buildings and equipment as well as the endowment. The Methodist Episcopal Church has gone on record as setting a standard of \$500,000 for endowment, and it makes these further qualitative statements:

"That in addition to tuition and other academic fees a minimum annual income of \$25,000 be required, becoming effective for the school year 1920-21."

"It is the sense of the University Senate that the standards required for membership in the Association of American Law Schools, the Association of Medical Colleges and the Dental Faculty Association of American Universities be approved as the standards of such institutions under the auspices of the Methodist Episcopal Church."

"The action of the Senate of 1914 permitting the inclusion of a percentage of notes to meet the endowment requirements is hereby rescinded. The Senate interprets endowment to mean actual funds invested in securities or realty from which the principal income is secured. Funds invested in college buildings, dormitories, or equipment must not be reported as endowment. It is understood that this resolution will go into effect with the new requirements for endowment, June 30, 1922."

The Council of Church Boards of Education, while repre-

¹The \$500,000 endowment becomes operative September 1, 1921, in Indiana for a standard college by action of the State Board of Education.

senting all the important Boards of Education with the exception of that of the Southern Baptist Convention, does no work in the field of standardization as usually defined. Neither does the Association of American Colleges, which brings together the largest group of colleges to be found in any single organization. The policy of the Association has always been one of inclusion and helpfulness rather than exclusion. There is no present sign that this policy will be changed. At the same time, the Council and the Association which, while not organically related, are sympathetic in purpose and method and which have a common central office, have contributed to the same results as the standardizing agencies, although by different methods.

These methods may be expressed by two words—*definition* and *publicity*. The definitions of an Efficient College and of a Minimum College completed after three years' study by the Association of American Colleges are well known and have been the basis of much college discussion and valuation. At present the Association and Council are publishing considerable material on the curriculum and the field and constituency of colleges which is proving very stimulating in many sections of the country. College and university faculties are making these publications the basis of helpful self-analyses. Charts are being given publicity through the Association Bulletin and *Christian Education* which bring together for immediate comparison the promise and performance of individual institutions in the field of the curriculum, setting forth, as they do, the tendencies of curriculum builders, of faculty offerings and of student registrations.

SUMMARY

Perhaps it would be fair to say that there are two tendencies at present among the Church Boards of Education in the field of standardization. One is the tendency to adopt the standards of the national and sectional agencies. The other is themselves to classify the institutions—in addition to the classification made by the volunteer agencies just referred to. On the whole, particularly if the functions of definition and publicity are recognized as parts of the process of standardization, the Boards are increasing rather than decreasing their activities in this field. It is certainly true, however, that the Boards and the institutions welcome the ratings given by the volunteer agencies when such ratings are the result of

careful investigation. Perhaps there is justification for this situation on three grounds:

1. The attitude of the Boards is sympathetic toward their institutions, and they have many opportunities for intimate knowledge. To say that the attitude is sympathetic is not to say that it is necessarily lenient. The Boards are apt to have financial resources at their command and the sense of responsibility for the expenditure of these resources usually operates against the exercise of leniency.

2. The Boards take cognizance of the institutions which do not meet the standard requirements, and by the establishment of various grades of achievement are able to render important service to those most needing it. The denominational Boards are not alone in appreciating this type of supervision. The State Board of Education of Indiana has lower standards than those of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Many Indiana high schools are certified by the North Central Association. These high schools derive all resulting benefits which come from this classification. There is no antagonism between the two systems and perhaps particularly because the North Central Association has high standards, the State Board has been justified in maintaining the lower standards.

3. The Boards have found that the process of fixing standards and classifying institutions is an important *educational process* within itself, the values of which would largely be lost if the work were turned over entirely to external agencies.

4. The Boards have frequently rendered a distinctive service to the State by setting higher standards than those of the State departments, thereby meeting the impact of criticism with which the State departments, more sensitive to unappreciative public opinion, could probably not successfully cope.

5. The Boards have found that an especial stimulus comes to institutions less favored because of the achievements of other institutions in the same denomination and the resulting recognition by denominational authorities.

6. In addition to operating helpfully in the educational field, these Boards stand for certain religious and moral ideals and accomplishments which the general standardizing agencies would not care to emphasize perhaps in an official way, since such an attitude might be interpreted as interfering with the principle of the separation of Church and State.

The denominational standardizing agencies have it within their power, in a word, to stimulate and supplement the activities of the general standardizing agencies. In some cases they set standards in advance of all others. They are not, or should not be, rival agencies, but should be, and usually are, conducted in such a way as to exert a wholesome influence on their own institutions and on others.

ROBERT L. KELLY.

Dangers of the Standardization Movement

HERE was a time when there appeared at a conference the devil's advocate, and I want to appear as the devil's advocate for a time now, because there is another side to this subject and I want to point out what that side is.

A long time ago Dr. Samuel Johnson prepared a dictionary and since then dictionaries have afflicted us more or less. Some of our friends in the English department claim that while these dictionaries have, on the whole, been useful, they have also had a deleterious effect, because English at that time was going through an evolution and they claim these dictionaries have prevented that evolution.

I wonder if our systems and standards are not going to do the same thing with education. Of course, we will all admit we are much wiser on educational matters than our grandfathers were, and I dare say that our grandchildren who will take hold of these things in our place will admit that they are much wiser than we are, and I wonder if it is wise to fix it so they cannot change them. As we adopt these systems and standards it will be very hard to change. In my opinion an educational system should be in a constant state of fluidity. I do not believe any of these plans are such that we are sure that they should not be changed, and if we are not sure, that is the very point, in my opinion, where they ought to be changed.

In other words, and in all seriousness, while I do not doubt these standardizing plans are good—I have had no share in the North Central Association in past years—I have in my mind the principle that we are making it difficult to improve things from what they are to something better, and I submit to the Committee on Policy¹ whether they can work out some way that will make these things flexible; not so rigid. They are too rigid.

Now, we have a system of fifteen units. There is nothing sacred about that. I have known students to go into college with

¹A committee appointed by the Conference to recommend a plan for unifying standardizing procedure.

ten units and do better than others with fifteen. The boy or girl who is ready to do college work and do it well ought to get into college. The boy or girl in college who can do the work and get out in three years ought not to be held to four years. There is nothing sacred about four years. So far as I know, we are the only country in the world that has a four-year college system. That is not a wonderful device. That just happened. All these things just happened, and whenever we find they can be improved, they ought to be improved.

I suggest that the Committee on Policy which has just been appointed by the Chair could very wisely take into consideration that among other things, how can we make it flexible and responsive to thought from time to time, so we can change it any time. I think it needs changing right now tremendously.

HARRY PRATT JUDSON.

Objectives of Standardization of Higher Institutions

I AM to talk for a little while on objectives of standardization. We saw yesterday from the remarks of Mr. Furst, that simple words have many meanings, as he showed us with the word "standard." It is equally apparent that there are many uses of the word "objectives." We were quite accustomed to that word during the war. Every military operation had some primary objective, and that was very different from the final objective of the whole struggle. So with educational objectives—some of them are primary and some of them are ultimate.

For example, some years ago many institutions were trying to conform to the requirements of the Carnegie Foundation. The definite objective in those cases was to get on the Carnegie list. Some of us who had been working on this matter of standardization for many years were amazed at the ease with which institutions could change their whole organization and meet immediately the requirements of the Carnegie Foundation.

Or, let us take the requirements of the Medical Council. They have been very insistent and very drastic, and yet they have been met to an extent that really has surprised everyone working in this field. Church boards also have the same experience. Whenever church boards begin to foster some great financial movement by which the colleges are to be profited, it is found that the question of standardization is much more easily handled. In all these cases the objective is to get on a certain list for the purpose of attaining certain definite advantages.

The objectives of the boards themselves vary very much from these primary college objectives of which I have spoken. Efforts of state boards of education have been directed chiefly toward teacher classification. They are interested in getting teachers, and they make regulations to this end. Church boards have a somewhat different standpoint and

make somewhat different requirements. The Carnegie Foundation is a notable example of a movement from a very limited objective to the widest possible one. In Mr. Carnegie's own mind was a pension bureau for college teachers, but when that proposition got into the hands of the directors of the Carnegie Foundation, the limited objective was expanded immediately to the widest possible educational movement.

In considering this whole question of standardization another thing strikes us at the very beginning. A very strange condition exists in the United States. If an educational commission were to come here from Europe, unacquainted with our affairs, they would be struck, first of all, with the fact that here is a national department of education, a United States bureau, and that it publishes a list of colleges and universities, and a pretty big list, and yet that list has no standing. The Bureau of the United States will give you a list of 500 colleges, but will not undertake to tell you what a college is. From the standpoint of European educational administration that would be a strange situation. Perhaps you might explain to them that educational jurisdiction has not been committed by the states to the general government, and, therefore, under our system of union, remains in the hands of the states. Then that commission would say, "Very well; each state has a department of education; we will go there and seek additional light on this question." But they would find where they seek light a continuance of darkness. They would find, outside of the State of New York, practically no effort to handle that question. They would find a criminal neglect of the whole proposition, whether in the granting of charters or in the regulation of institutions in the most elementary fashion.

Now, it is this condition of educational chaos in this country that has brought into existence these many standardizing agencies which we discussed yesterday. They are all useful, but a larger work can be done by a body such as this. This larger work involves some very simple elements.

All would agree, I think, that clearness of conception is one thing that we are trying to bring about. Clearness of conception is essential to clearness of statement. We may differ as to how far a definition shall go, but educational terminology ought to be intelligible. While there will never be a standard

in education comparable to standards of measure fixed by law, yet we ought to have standards of education so definite that people understand what you are talking about when you use certain language. This in itself would result in the improvement of educational work.

Every effort at standardization results in elevating educational work. The purpose of sectional associations, like the Southern Association or the North Central, is that of reform. The motive for the existence of these associations is self-improvement. Their efforts at standardization have been aimed at their own members. The Southern Association, for instance, never started out with the idea of disciplining any institution outside of the Association, but with the idea of disciplining its own members, and of holding to certain ideals that they would with absolute frankness put into effect.

The purpose, therefore, of this whole movement for higher standards is to stimulate our educational work and make it better. Necessarily that will mean some repression, but this is incidentally involved and not directly aimed at.

The report given by Dr. Colwell yesterday indicated a very definite objective on the part of the Medical Association to get rid of some medical schools, because the Association recognized that we had far too many. From our standpoint repression does not mean that. We have not too many schools or too many colleges. We are not trying to get rid of any college, but by elevation of standards to get institutions in the right category; to build up junior colleges, for example, out of many institutions that had the name of standard colleges; Their task, altogether essential, altogether desirable, will be better done under a truer name than it can be done under any name that is not absolutely fair and square.

There are some things that I make bold to say are not our objectives at all, and yet which have been more than once charged against various associations that are active in this standardization work. We are not aiming at any deadly uniformity in institutional life. On the contrary, in my opinion, that would be wholly undesirable. I think we should cultivate variety in educational work. We need colleges that adhere to the old classical curriculum, and by their mode of entrance and by their curriculum offer to students wanting that kind of course the best advantages possible. Students who do

not want that ought not to go there. On the other hand, colleges connected with our great universities, colleges that take one thousand, two thousand, or three thousand students must belong to a very different type of institution.

We aim at no deadly uniformity, nor do we desire in any way to make impossible the coming up of new institutions. We do not advocate an educational trust. No association that is standardizing colleges has any desire whatever to keep any institution out of the association or off of its list. Yet again and again all of them have rejected institutions. Neither have they any desire to interfere with educational evolution. That is not the objective. The evolution of our whole educational system has gone on and will go on.

Our honored Chairman yesterday made some remarks warning us about that, but I venture to say that the very illustrations he used are not examples of uniformity brought about through standardizing agencies. The four year curriculum is in no sense the result of any standardizing agency. And even the fifteen units that might seem to be somewhat the result of the standardizing agencies, have been more truly imposed upon the colleges by the high schools. That is merely a convenient expression now for the differentiation of school and college work. And so educational evolution goes on all through the college curriculum, in the relation of academic work to vocational work and professional work. Colleges that are large enough develop special courses for law students, for commercial students, for medical students, and in that way the college course is preparatory, or even is dovetailed into the professional course.

Further, it is not our aim or purpose to make a program for any ideal institution. We are standardizing our work for the benefit of the minimum college rather than the ideal college. We never express in the requirements that are suggested any ideas that would serve to limit an institution in its development. From the standpoint of most of the institutions that belong to these associations, the minimum requirements as laid down have no effect. They are not applied as hindrances. Now, if these requirements are not burdensome to ourselves any longer, their value is chiefly seen in the influence that they have upon a large number of educational institutions that are trying to meet them. The minimum require-

ment becomes the ideal for many of these institutions,—and there are very many of them.

A few years ago a count in the southern states indicated about 360 colleges claiming to be colleges, and in all that number there were only about forty that were able to get into the Southern Association. That is, there were only about forty that could meet the minimum requirements we have adopted for a standard college. But 320 others of that great throng of institutions coveted the name, and used the name of standard colleges.

We shall have very soon the report of the committee that no doubt will focus our attention on some important things, but I shall, in a preliminary way, lay down a few general principles that may aid us in the discussion. There are some things, I think, that ought to be avoided. We ought to avoid frequent changes in standards. We ought to avoid especially non-vital elements. I think we have not done that in the past. There comes to my mind a requirement that the women have set forth in a demand that an institution shall recognize the influence of women in its board and faculty and general administration. Now, it may be a very excellent thing to put a woman on the board or in the faculty, but I submit that this has no place in any enumeration of educational requirements. It may be good politics but it is not education and it does not bear on the educational problem.

Or, take another illustration. We find in our Association—and I prefer to quote the Southern Association, of which my institution is a member, rather than any other—a tendency to run to too many figures. The library must have so many books; it must have \$500 a year, and then you change another year to \$600. There must be \$2,000 in chemical apparatus, \$2,500 in physics, and so on. Now we get nowhere, in my opinion, by that eternal struggle with figures. Nor do I think we get very far in any effort to fix salaries. Very quickly your educational association is interpreted as an effort on the part of professors to boost their own salaries, and to turn the educational association into a professors' union.

A positive program from my point of view centers around the creation of an efficient standardizing agency. It should never be mechanical. In so far as it is it is not worth preserving. A standardizing agency implies or involves a stand-

ardizing agent, and the agent is the principal party. It is a personal task. Information may have to be secured by printed documents from every institution, by catalogues, reports, financial statements on the one hand; again, by questionnaires, for printed reports are always inadequate and misleading. And last of all, personal inspection is essential. Without that we get nowhere.

I bring these remarks to a conclusion by laying before you, not without some hesitation, my own definition of a college with administrative suggestions for testing standards. These administrative rules are the real heart of the matter. Without them the definition would be vain.

I

DEFINITION

A college is an educational institution which admits students only after the completion of a high school course of four years or its equivalent, which gives courses of study in academic subjects covering four years of tested work leading to further graduate or professional study and meeting the standards imposed by the best graduate schools. It must have material resources stable and adequate to care for all work provided or promised.

II

ADMINISTRATIVE SUGGESTIONS

1. In admitting students no conditions are to be allowed. Each college may determine its policy as to free or required units, but the total should always be 15 good and acceptable units. Entrance requirements should have definite relation to the curriculum offered.

2. Stable resources call for endowment or support by taxation. Annual contributions of religious societies may be accepted, but should not be regraded as permanently satisfactory. Student fees cannot more than meet teaching salaries, and should not be expected to provide more than half the income even of the minimum college. Colleges providing intensive work in a small group of subjects will necessarily expend \$200 to \$300 per student, and larger institutions with a broader curriculum will find necessary an annual expenditure ranging from \$300 to \$500 per student. Permanent endow-

ment, therefore, should not be less than \$3,000 for each student, and if the institution offers wider choice of courses, a minimum endowment of \$5,000 per student will be required. The salary schedule must be sufficiently liberal to hold the services of able, experienced and well trained teachers. Adequate appropriations must be made for laboratories and libraries. Buildings must meet the needs of all educational work offered. Any marked inferiority or insufficiency in material resources may be accepted as a strong indication of unsatisfactory educational conditions.

3. The college year should cover 34 weeks of actual work, and requirements for the Bachelor degree should cover not less than 120 semester hours of instruction exclusive of all requirements for physical training. The number of departments should be sufficient to provide four years of thorough work for each student, and requirements for graduation should necessitate earnest and successful work on the part of every student.

The educational preparation or standing of the faculty must guarantee their work in the class room. The amount of work required of each teacher, the salary paid, the facilities provided, are educational factors of the utmost importance.

Consideration must also be given to such intangible elements as scholarly atmosphere, academic history, connection with professional schools of high or low grade, and moral influences vitally affecting the life and training of every student.

4. In every attempt at classification or standardization, personal inspection should supplement written or printed reports. Publicity as to all material facts is a prime test of an efficient institution.

JAMES H. KIRKLAND.

Latin-American Academic Credentials

RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE ADMISSION OF HOLDERS OF CERTAIN DEGREES AND CERTIFICATES FROM LATIN-AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS TO STUDY AT AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

THE Committee on International Educational Relations of the American Council on Education has appointed the undersigned to serve as a special sub-committee to make recommendations regarding the rating by American institutions of holders of academic credentials from secondary and higher institutions in Latin-American countries. There are already several thousand Latin-American students at colleges, universities and professional schools in the United States. It is expected that even larger numbers will attend institutions in this country in the near future in order to complete their general or professional training. The appropriate academic rating of these students is therefore a matter of considerable importance to college officers.

Although the educational systems of the several Latin-American countries are fundamentally similar, there are, of course, differences in organization and nomenclature. Accurate and satisfactory recommendations must take these differences into account. The Committee is, nevertheless, of the opinion that a tentative report, intended to serve as a general guide in case the institution from which a candidate may come is not known to the officers of the American college or university to which he seeks entrance, may be of temporary assistance to academic officers in this country. The recommendations submitted below are confessedly of this temporary and tentative character. The Committee hopes to be able to issue at future dates somewhat more detailed discussions of the educational systems of the several Latin-American countries made by persons who have had an opportunity to investigate these conditions at first hand. Special attention is called to the fact that the recommendation of the somewhat limited amount of credit for the holders of the bachelor's degree from Latin-American institu-

tions is due in part to the difficulties which these students encounter in adjusting themselves to academic work in a foreign language.

The Committee calls especial attention to the existence of the Section of Education of the Pan American Union at Washington. This Section has prepared monographs dealing with various phases of Latin-American secondary and higher education. It has access to the latest official publications and is at all times ready to supply college and university officers with information drawn from these sources concerning education in Latin-American countries. Communications should be addressed to the Assistant Director of the Pan American Union, Dr. Francisco J. Yáñez, who is in charge of the Section of Education.

The typical Latin-American secondary school resembles more closely the secondary schools of the countries of Continental Europe than the prevailing type of secondary school in the United States. The length of the secondary school course varies in Latin-American countries. It may cover a period of four, five or six years. The diploma or degree given upon the completion of the secondary school course is commonly that of bachelor. In some cases this degree is conferred after four years of general secondary education and one or two years of professional preparatory work.

Specifically the Committee recommends:

1. That holders of the bachelor's degree granted upon the completion of the secondary course in Latin-American countries be admitted provisionally to the freshman class of a college or university in the United States. At times it will be desirable that holders of the bachelor's degree who intend to enter a curriculum in engineering or chemistry should spend one year in a college of liberal arts before beginning their engineering or chemical training.
2. That holders of the bachelor's degree granted upon the completion of the secondary school course in Latin-American countries be admitted provisionally to the freshman classes of colleges of agriculture or veterinary medicine.
3. That duly accredited graduates of primary normal schools in Latin-American countries be admitted provisionally to the freshman class of a teachers college or of a college of liberal arts in the United States.
4. That duly accredited graduates of higher normal schools should be entitled to advanced standing in a college of education or in a college of liberal arts in the United States, the precise amount

of such advanced credit to be determined upon examination of the individual case.

5. That courses certified by diplomas from commercial schools of high standing in Latin-American countries be rated as equivalent to courses pursued at similar secondary institutions in the United States.

6. That Latin-American students holding the bachelor's degree who have not pursued pre-professional courses after graduation from their respective secondary schools should be held to the same amount of pre-professional study as is required of students in the United States. This recommendation applies especially to the pre-professional requirements for the study of medicine, law or dentistry.

7. All certificates and diplomas to be accepted by universities of the United States must be signed by the school authorities and their signatures certified by the diplomatic authorities of the country from which the applicant comes, as well as by the American diplomatic representative in that country.

8. All certificates and diplomas to be given weight in the universities of the United States must state clearly the subjects covered, the exact extent of the subjects, the text books used, the amount of laboratory work completed and the amount of time given to lecture and laboratory work in each case. The years in which the courses prescribed were successfully completed should also be noted.

The Committee is bringing the substance of recommendations seven and eight to the attention of Latin-American educational officers through governmental channels.

HERMAN V. AMES, *Chairman.*

E. E. BRANDON,

STEPHEN P. DUGGAN,

S. W. INMAN,

P. A. MARTIN,

W. R. SHEPHERD,

G. A. SHERWELL,

F. J. YÁNES,

S. P. CAPEN, *Secretary.*

The Educational Record

Published Quarterly By

The American Council on Education

Volume 2

October, 1921

No. 4

Editor:

SAMUEL PAUL CAPEN

CONTENTS

Annual Meeting of the American Council on Education

Report of the Director.

Report of the Treasurer.

Director's Budget for 1921-22.

Report of the Executive Committee.

Report of the Committee on Training of Women for Professional Service.

Report of the Committee on Cooperation with Industries.

Report of the Committee on Education for Citizenship.

Report of the Committee on Franco-American Exchange of Scholarships and Fellowships.

Report of the Committee on Federal Legislation.

Report of the Committee on International Educational Relations.

Report of the Special Committee on Policy.

New Federal Legislation

By the Editor

Membership of the American Council on Education and of its Committees

Annual Subscription, \$2.00

**COPYRIGHT, 1921
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION**

The Annual Meeting of the American Council on Education

THE Fourth Annual Meeting of the American Council on Education was held in Washington May 6 and 7, 1921. There were three sessions. The first session was occupied by the annual business meeting of the Council. The reports of officers and committees presented at this business meeting appear in the following pages.

The second and third sessions were devoted to a Conference on Methods of Standardizing and Accrediting Colleges. The Conference was called jointly by the National Conference Committee on Standards of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and the American Council on Education. A large number of bodies are now defining or approving colleges and are publishing lists of accredited higher institutions. There is wide variety in the standards proposed and perhaps still greater diversity in the methods of applying them. The Conference was called to determine whether greater uniformity of procedure might be possible, and if so, how it might be brought about. The question was discussed by representatives of a number of the principal standardizing agencies. Their addresses were printed in *THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD*, Volume II, Number 3. At the close of the second session a Committee on Policy was appointed. During the third session the Committee presented a report which was unanimously adopted. See page 154.

Report of the Director

THE activities in which the Director has been concerned may be grouped under three heads—the work of the Council's office, the work of committees of the Council, and individual services.

THE COUNCIL'S OFFICE

Certain large tasks have fallen to the Council's office during the past year. The legislative situation has demanded a great deal of attention. Immediately after the last meeting of the Council, the office issued the referendum ballot and accompanying documents referred to in the report of the chairman of the Committee on Federal Legislation. As the returns have come in they have been classified and tabulated. The office has also kept close watch on new legislative measures introduced, has summarized all those of importance and has carried on a considerable correspondence with persons interested in one or another of these proposals.

Four issues of *THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD* have been published since the last meeting of the Council. Comment on these is unnecessary as they have come into the hands not only of every member of the Council, but also of the president of every higher institution. The general editorial policy may, however, be noted. Only such matters have been included in *THE RECORD* as have been judged to be of wide national significance and to have bearing on the major purposes of the Council. This editorial restriction has kept *THE RECORD* small in bulk, but its distinctive character has been maintained.

An organization supported as is the Council, by contributions from numerous agencies and institutions, has of necessity a considerable task in keeping its financial house in order. With the increase in the Council's membership this

task has become still more time consuming. The reports of the treasurer and the auditor indicate something of what is involved and show that the financial condition of the Council is sound.

The Council's office is the handmaid of all its committees. In connection with the committees' work there is a large amount of correspondence. Many reports and inquiries must also be prepared. The rising tide of correspondence is apparently a testimony to the Council's usefulness, but it is beginning to assume the aspects of a problem. The daily average of letters sent from the office is in the neighborhood of 40.

WORK OF COMMITTEES

The Council works primarily through standing committees. During the past year but one new committee has been appointed. At the request of the International Research Council the Executive Committee designated a Committee on International Auxiliary Language to serve in cooperation with similar committees appointed by other national and international bodies to study this problem, which is now becoming so important to the world of science. The other agencies with which the Council's committee is to deal have not all been appointed. The committee has, therefore, not been called into session.

Each of the standing committees, with the exception of the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Cooperating Societies has held at least one meeting, during the year just passed. Their several activities have already been summarized in the reports of their respective chairmen.

Certain members of the Council will perhaps recall that the annual meeting two years ago authorized the appointment of two other standing committees, namely, a Committee on the Status and Problems of the College of Arts and Sciences, and a Committee on Information and Standards. The tasks indicated in the titles of these two committees make an especially strong appeal to me and I judge that their

importance has also deeply impressed the members of the Executive Committee. Nevertheless, the members of these committees have never been appointed. The initiative in making the appointments was assigned to the Director. Circumstances which were alluded to at the last annual meeting of the Council explain the delay in creating these committees. A Committee on the Status and Problems of the College of Arts and Sciences could hardly do much without funds larger than could now be appropriated to its purposes out of the Council's budget. The Council approached the General Education Board and one other foundation with a request for a subvention to support a program for such a committee. Its request was denied by both foundations. It has, therefore, seemed best to the Director to delay the creation of the committee until, through economy, the Council's surplus may provide for its operation, or until the money may be forthcoming from some other source.

It also seemed wise to defer the creation of the Committee on Information and Standards until a general conference of standardizing agencies should have been held. This conference has been arranged with the cordial cooperation of all of the principal bodies engaged in defining college standards. Your programs will have told you that it follows directly upon the present session.

INDIVIDUAL SERVICES

The Director has been called upon to render a large variety of services which have appeared to bear a definite relation to the larger purposes for which the Council was established. It would be difficult to classify them and an enumeration would doubtless prove tedious. A few of the more important ones may, however, be mentioned.

By reason of the character of the membership of the Council, the Director's office has early and intimate information concerning most movements of importance in the field of higher education. Apparently many college and university officers are aware of this fact. A sort of consulta-

tion service has, therefore, become an important part of the Director's duties. This service has ranged from the answering of somewhat casual questions to advising boards of trustees and institutional executives on matters relating to the budget, administrative appointments, and curriculum reorganization.

The Director has also been called upon to render two services of somewhat larger importance. The Commonwealth Fund appropriated \$100,000 for the fiscal year ending September, 1921, for the promotion of educational research. The establishment of a policy to govern the expenditure of the appropriation and the apportionment of the fund to subsidize promising pieces of research were placed in the hands of a special committee representing educational research activities in different parts of the United States. The Director was invited to serve as secretary of this committee, and with the approval of the Council's Executive Committee has carried on this work.

The National Association of State Universities at its last convention in Washington voted to request the Director to draft a plan in accordance with which State universities might survey themselves. The request was acceded to and a plan prepared. This has been printed as a bulletin of the Association of State Universities and circulated among the association's membership. The Council's office has been informed that certain institutions have already undertaken to investigate their internal operations in accordance with the suggestions made.

The Director has judged it desirable to attend the annual meetings of as many of the constituent members of the Council as possible. In no other way can the Council's office be informed of the principal developments affecting the groups that make up its membership. The associations also have expressed an interest in learning at first hand of the Council's activities. Ideally the Director should attend at least fifteen such conventions a year. Uncompromising factors of time and space have interfered with the carrying

out of an ideal program, however. Actually he has been present at the annual meetings of nine constituent members and four associate members of the Council.

He has also represented the Council on the Board of Trustees of the American University Union in Europe, the Division of Educational Relations of the National Research Council, the International Serbian Educational Committee, and the National Dante Committee.

In the light of another year's experience the suggestions made in the Director's report last May have undergone certain minor modifications. But my views as to the proper sphere of the Council's activities remain substantially unchanged. I still believe that the Council should keep clear of administrative undertakings. Its funds would not cover many activities of this sort. The one such enterprise which it now conducts, namely, the French Scholarship Exchange, absorbs as large a percentage of its income and of the time of its employees as is justifiable. I am still convinced that the true sphere of the Council should be the study of larger questions of educational policy. The Council should be the medium through which the best opinion in the field of educational administration may be focussed on the most important problems which confront large groups of institutions. An agency sufficiently representative to undertake these tasks is now more needed than ever. Some of the principal problems were touched upon at the last meeting of the Council. Others are in the minds of all of you. Nevertheless, to illustrate the point I wish to make, I will venture to mention a few that seem to me to be most pressing.

We are certainly not yet out of the woods in the matter of federal legislation affecting education. All members of the Council have had an opportunity to express themselves on the propositions involved in the Smith-Towner Bill and on certain of the larger principles which should underlie governmental participation in education. The results of the Council's referendum on this subject show so wide a diver-

gence of opinion among our membership concerning the Smith-Towner Bill itself that united action by the Council with regard to it is probably out of the question. But I trust I shall not be regarded as a prejudiced witness when I say that there is no assurance that the Sterling-Towner Bill (the successor of the Smith-Towner Bill) will have the right of way before Congress. We are shortly to hear from General Sawyer, who sponsors the creation of a Department of Public Welfare, to include, among other things, the principal educational offices of the government. If such a measure is passed it is not unlikely that action on the Sterling-Towner Bill will be indefinitely postponed. It should also be remembered that the Congressional Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Government Departments may make its report before the passage of either the Sterling-Towner Bill or the bill for a Department of Public Welfare, and it may submit proposals affecting education which differ from either of these others. It seems to me probable, therefore, that in spite of the lack of unanimity of opinion concerning the provisions of the Sterling-Towner Bill, the Council may yet be called upon to help present to Congress the views of educational officers regarding certain essential elements in a new Government office designed to coordinate the Government's educational activities.

I am sure that I shall not be forestalling the results of the conference which begins this afternoon if I assert that a definition of college standards that will be generally accepted and that will both stimulate and do justice to collegiate institutions must be agreed upon within the next few years. In bringing this to pass the Council obviously has an important rôle to play.

Intimately connected with the movement, however, is the necessity of a review of the whole situation of colleges of arts and sciences, because an entity can scarcely be standardized or defined until there is substantial agreement with respect to its purposes and distinguishing characteristics. I have already discussed this subject before members of the

Council on previous occasions. I merely allude to it now to emphasize anew my belief that it remains one of the outstanding problems of the field of higher education.

Moreover, the present situation of the college of arts and sciences raises a number of related questions in the mind of every student of education. I recall an entertaining address by Professor Brander Matthews on the subject "Why Five Acts?" He contended that the traditional five act division of European drama was pure accident. It arose from the fact that the majority of Euripides' later plays contained four choral interludes. Euripides' Roman imitators saw a structural principle and a system in this accidental dramatic division. Hence the five act tradition which through the centuries dominated European drama.

There is a certain parallelism in the field of higher education. With equal pertinence one might ask the question: "Why Four Years?" If four years is regarded as an immutable requirement for higher liberal education, is the course in dentistry of necessity of the same length? Is it in accordance with a law of nature or merely by the accident of tradition that the same period of time should be demanded of neophytes in business, agriculture, a dozen different kinds of engineering, medicine, pharmacy, and veterinary medicine? There are many of us who believe that a re-examination of professional and higher vocational training, with fresh reference to the demands of the several callings, would lead to some startling conclusions concerning the time element in such training. Indeed a review—I believe a periodic review—of the administrative organization of the higher educational system is imperatively demanded. Effective articulation between training and professional requirements demands it. The rising cost of education, the growing difficulty of financing it on any terms emphasizes the necessity.

Another large problem which is national in scope and affects the membership of practically every association of higher institutions is the illogical distribution of establishments for expensive professional training. There is a large

surplusage of schools and departments devoted to certain kinds of professional education. There is an equally serious shortage of facilities for training in other professions. Moreover, expensive professional training facilities are concentrated in a few regions. Competition between the institutions offering these facilities is unavoidable. At the same time the limits of the field of university education are constantly expanding. All universities are called upon to furnish more different kinds of training than they can afford to maintain. It is patent that before long each of our higher educational establishments, even the richest, will have to select a relatively small number of branches in which it will offer professional education. Each will have to specialize and the directions in which each is to specialize should be determined by its location, its equipment, and by the demands of its constituency. If gradually and by joint agreement the distribution of schools for higher professional training could be arranged in accordance with a systematic plan, the interests of the country would be greatly served.

I have mentioned these matters by way of illustration, not with the thought that they represent an exhaustive catalogue. They are typical of the many problems of large policy in the domain of higher education. Some demand immediate solution. Some are more remote. All emphasize again the familiar fact that the development of the American educational scheme has been planless, haphazard. We have always suffered because of this planlessness. The price that we are called upon to pay for our lack of forethought and the consequent lack of system becomes heavier year by year. Unified action has always been impossible because there was no unifying agency. There has been no means even to create a consensus of opinion. A unifying agency has now at last been established. To stimulate discussion, to focus opinion, and in the end to bring about joint action on major matters of higher educational policy—these are the things that the American Council on Education was created to do. Supported as it is, it must naturally begin modestly.

But its primary purpose should always be kept before the eyes of its members and of the general public. As its resources increase it should turn them to the accomplishment of that purpose. This is the justification for the Council's existence, or there is none.

Respectfully submitted,

S. P. CAPEN.

Treasurer's Report

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

May 1, 1920, to April 30, 1921

RECEIPTS

Constituent Members.....	\$ 1,100.00
Associate Members.....	90.00
Institutional Members.....	19,650.00
	<hr/>
	\$20,840.00
Donation.....	50.00
Subscriptions to EDUCATIONAL RECORD and Extra copies.....	99.50
Refund from Commonwealth Fund for stenographic services, etc., in connection with Committee on Educational Research.....	143.72
Interest on bank deposits.....	140.64
	<hr/>
Total Receipts.....	\$21,273.86
Cash on Hand May 1, 1920.....	8,664.20
	<hr/>
	\$29,938.06

DISBURSEMENTS

Salaries:	
Director.....	\$7,500.00
Assistants.....	3,893.51
Rent.....	1,200.00
Stationery, Printing and Supplies.....	800.37
Postage.....	300.03
Telephone and Telegrams.....	341.01
General Expense.....	376.23
Annual Meeting, May, 1920.....	310.20
Traveling Expenses of Director.....	1,378.71
Committees:	
Executive.....	\$ 175.19
Franco-American Exchange of Scholarships	2,746.00
Education for Citizenship.....	234.24
International Educational Relations....	34.38
Other Committees.....	504.73
	<hr/>
	3,694.54
Publication Expenses of Educational Record.....	1,380.50
Furniture and Fixtures.....	322.25
	<hr/>
Total Disbursements.....	\$21,497.35
Cash on Hand April 30, 1921.....	8,440.71
	<hr/>
	\$29,938.06

Cash on hand April 30, 1921.....	\$8,440.71
Accounts Receivable.....	<u>5,050.00</u>
	\$13,490.71

Less:

Balance of \$1,000 appropriated to Committee on Education for Citizenship.....	\$427.61
Balance of \$2,000 appropriated to Franco-American Exchange Com- mittee.....	<u>400.00</u>
	<u>827.61</u>
Balance of Cash and Accounts Receivable to July 1, 1921.....	\$12,663.10

Directors' Budget* for 1921-22

Membership fees for 1921-22 (approximate).....	\$24,000.00
Estimated balance July 1, 1921.....	8,000.00
 Resources for fiscal year 1921-22.....	 <u>\$32,000.00</u>
 Estimated Expenses:	
Rent.....	\$1,200.00
Salary of Director.....	7,500.00
Salaries of Assistants.....	5,500.00
Traveling Expenses.....	5,000.00
Stationery and Miscellaneous Printing.....	1,000.00
Telephone and Telegrams.....	500.00
Postage.....	600.00
Office Appliances.....	350.00
THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD.....	1,600.00
Expenses of Committee on Franco-American Exchange of Fellowships and Scholarships.....	2,000.00
Expenses of Committee on Federal Legislation.....	1,000.00
Incidentals.....	<u>500.00</u>
 Total.....	 <u>\$26,750.00</u>
Balance of appropriation due to Committee on Education for Citizenship.....	<u>427.61</u>
 Total estimated expenses.....	 <u>\$27,177.61</u>
Total surplus.....	<u>\$4,822.39</u>

*This Budget was amended as provided in the report of the Executive Committee (see p. 142).

Report of the Executive Committee

THE Executive Committee has held four meetings as prescribed in the constitution. The dates of these meetings have been September 25, 1920, December 4, 1920, March 8, 1921, and May 5, 1921.

SCHOLARSHIP EXCHANGES

Its first meeting was held just subsequent to the arrival of the French scholarship holders assigned to American colleges and universities. The appropriation made by the Council in June to cover the expenses of this exchange proved to be short of the actual requirements. The Executive Committee, therefore, authorized the payment of emergency bills incurred, particularly in connection with the entertainment of French girls in New York.

In connection with the scholarship undertaking, the Executive Committee also appropriated for the expenses of the Franco-American Exchange Committee for the year 1921-22, \$2,000. A tentative plan for the establishment of fellowships for British students in American universities, submitted by Professor Frank Aydelotte, the American Secretary of the Rhodes Scholarship Trust, was approved by the Committee with certain minor modifications.

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS

The Finance Committee of the Council, having regarded itself as discharged, upon the completion of its initial task in financing the Council in 1919, the Executive Committee reappointed the following gentlemen to serve as members of the Committee: President Donald J. Cowling, President M. L. Burton, and Bishop T. J. Shahan, and requested the Committee to undertake to secure additional institutional members of the Council. The Committee's success in this undertaking has been reported by its chairman.

It also appointed a standing committee on An International Auxiliary Language consisting of the following gentlemen: Professor Raymond Weeks, Professor Herman Collitz, Professor Kenneth McKenzie, Professor William A. Nitze, Professor Frederick Klaeber and Professor Irving Fisher. This Committee is instructed to cooperate with committees of the International Research Council and other organizations in studying the possibilities and promoting the utilization of one or more international auxiliary languages. The Committee was appointed at the request of the International Research Council.

The Committee voted to accept for the Council membership in a national committee organized to coordinate the activities of societies dealing with the promotion of Americanization. A congress called by this National Committee was held in Washington, March 15, 1921. The Council was represented at the congress by Dr. Charles R. Mann and Mr. Arthur W. Dunn, both members of the Council's standing Committee on Education for Citizenship.

On recommendation of the Committee on International Educational Relations, the Committee voted to appoint, in conjunction with the Institute of International Education, a Committee on Educational Cooperation with Mexico.

ACTIVITIES OF THE DIRECTOR

The Committee authorized the Director to serve as secretary of the Educational Research Committee of the Commonwealth Fund. It also authorized him to act as chairman of the commission appointed by the Carnegie Corporation to make a survey of the Carnegie Institute of Technology in Pittsburgh. It instructed him to take up with the National Conference Committee on Standards of Colleges and Secondary Schools the arrangement of a joint conference of the representatives of the principal standardizing agencies with a view to bringing about uniformity of definition of acceptable collegiate standards and of accrediting procedure.

The Committee has had submitted to it a large number of proposals for action by the Council. These have been studied with some care, but affirmative action has been taken only in the directions reported above.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends to the Council:

1. That the budget submitted by the Director for the fiscal year 1921-22 be approved, except that the estimate for the publication of THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD be raised to \$2,000.
2. That the Committee on International Educational Relations be instructed to appoint, in conjunction with the Institute of International Education, a Committee on Educational Cooperation with Mexico, this Committee to serve as a sub-committee of the Committee on International Educational Relations.¹
3. That the Nominating Committee be requested to nominate three representatives of the Council to serve on the administrative board of the Institute of International Education. The three representatives now serving were appointed by the Executive Committee in the interval between Council meetings. It is suggested that the Nominating Committee nominate one representative to serve one year, one to serve two years, and one to serve three years.
4. That it be the policy of the Council not to endorse petitions, memorials, and legislative proposals submitted by other organizations unless the Council has an opportunity to study these in detail and to form a matured opinion. In any event, the Council should not endorse proposals relating to other than educational matters.

Respectfully submitted,

VIRGINIA C. GILDERSLEEVE,

Secretary.

The four recommendations proposed by the Executive Committee were adopted by the Council.

¹ See Report of the Committee on International Educational Relations, p. 153.

Report of the Committee on Training of Women for Professional Service

THE Committee has held two meetings. It has devoted itself to the furtherance of the project reported to the Council a year ago. Dr. Elizabeth Kemper Adams, one of its members, has undertaken to prepare a report embodying a description of the several independent agencies engaged in studying occupations for women and methods of placement. A preliminary outline of the report and certain tentative conclusions are already in the hands of the Committee. The general scope of these is as follows:

The report embodies the results of an extensive series of personal interviews with the heads of organizations engaged in studying professional training, professional supply and distribution in New York and Washington. These are reinforced by returns from a list of questions submitted to fourteen bureaus of occupations for professional and educated women and certain bureaus rendering a service of information and placement. The report will point out:

(a) That there is every indication of the development of a careful and concerted effort to study the several professions and the supply and distribution of professional workers, and to provide detailed and current information on these matters to college undergraduates, from whom professional workers are largely and increasingly recruited.

(b) That in any such movement both men and women must be considered, and such topics as the present distribution of men and women in the different professions and the recruiting of the professions from both men and women students, and their professional distribution, must be studied much more carefully than has been done hitherto. It is, therefore, important to emphasize the fact that in the future,

far more than in the past, the professions will comprise both men and women, and that the many problems of professional personnel should be dealt with as involving both men and women, with neither group considered in isolation from the other. The day of studying occupations for women is over. The present problem is that of women in occupations.

Respectfully submitted,

GERTRUDE S. MARTIN,

Chairman.

Report of Standing Committee on Cooperation With Industry

THE Council, at its last annual meeting, authorized the appointment of a standing committee on Cooperation with Industry. The Committee was designed to act with a similar body to be appointed by the newly established Council of Management Education, to assist in the formulation of specifications for the training of persons for executive and managerial positions in connection with industry.

The Committee met on December 15 in Philadelphia to consider the first draft of educational specifications submitted by eight different industries. The Committee recommended certain revisions of the material and appointed two of its members to work with the industrial representatives in preparing a sample sheet of educational specifications covering a single industry.

Respectfully submitted,

F. L. BISHOP,
Chairman.

Report of the Committee on Education for Citizenship

AT the last meeting of the Council the Committee on Education for Citizenship presented a program of the work which it proposed to undertake. The principal items in this program were:

1. To prepare a statement of the essentials of American citizenship.
2. To address its attention primarily to the problem of training for citizenship in colleges and other higher institutions, particularly in teachers' colleges and normal schools.
3. To assist in working out the plan for education for citizenship in army camps.

The last of these undertakings demanded immediate action and seemed to the Committee to furnish the most fruitful avenue of approach to the larger problems to which it had committed itself. Members of the Committee, therefore, cooperated with the educational experts of the War Plans Division of the General Staff in formulating the principles on which education for citizenship is now being carried forward in the United States Army. A report prepared by Professor J. G. deRoulhac Hamilton and Professor E. W. Knight, of the University of North Carolina, and printed as a War Department document under the title "Education for Citizenship," represents the outcome of these efforts.

The Committee has held one meeting. At that meeting the general scope of the Committee's final report was determined. It was voted to request Professors Hamilton and Knight (with the assistance of certain other members of the Committee) to undertake the preparation of a report which should include the substance of the monograph published by the War Department, an account of what teachers' colleges and normal schools are now doing to prepare teachers for courses in citizenship, a résumé of various important new

experiments in education for citizenship now being carried on in colleges and universities (such as the Columbia University course in Contemporary Civilization, the courses at the University of Missouri and Stanford University), and certain suggestive outlines of procedure that may be adopted by higher institutions.

The Committee expects to have this report ready for its consideration early in the autumn.

Respectfully submitted,

M. L. BURTON,

Chairman.

Report of the Committee on Franco-American Exchange of Fellowships and Scholarships

THE administration of the Franco-American scholarships exchanges, formerly carried on by the Association of American Colleges, was transferred by that Association to the Council just before the last annual meeting of the Council. The exchange involves the selection of American young women to receive the scholarships offered by the French Government in certain lycées, in the École Normale St. Germaine en Laye and the École Normale de Sèvre. It involves, also, the securing of scholarships which include tuition, board, and room rent for French girls in American institutions, and assistance in the selection of the French candidates for these scholarships. At its last meeting the Council appropriated \$1,000 for the expense of this Committee for the year 1920.

Twenty-five American girls were selected from among 69 applicants for the scholarships offered by the French Government. Reports received from the Office national des Universités et Écoles françaises indicate that practically without exception these girls have made good records and have proved acceptable to the French educational authorities. The selection of them was entrusted to a special sub-committee, the members of which were Professor Margaret E. Maltby, Miss Mary M. Finn, Miss Virginia Newcomb and Monsieur Champenois.

Another sub-committee composed of Miss Virginia Newcomb, Miss Mary M. Finn and Professor Jessica B. Peixotto spent a portion of the summer of 1920 in France assisting in the selection of the new French candidates for the scholarships offered by American colleges. Thirty-nine scholarships were offered and 32 girls were selected jointly by the

Committee and the French authorities and were accompanied to the United States by Miss Finn in September, 1920. Candidates were selected for all the scholarships offered, but illness and other causes led to the dropping out of several before the date set for their departure.

A third sub-committee, under the chairmanship of Dean Virginia C. Gildersleeve, of Barnard College, had charge of the reception in New York of the American girls en route for France and the French girls assigned to American colleges and universities. The Institute of International Education contributed largely to make the reception a success.

In addition to the 32 new incumbents of scholarships offered by American institutions, 42 French girls held for a second year scholarships secured for them by the Association of American Colleges.

The Committee believes that the Council may take considerable satisfaction in the records of these young women. Reports received by the members of the Committee show that nearly all of them are highly regarded, both as students and as members of the several academic communities to which they have been assigned. Nearly every college has been ready to renew its scholarship offers even in spite of the present unusual financial pressure. The French scholarship exchange is an assured success.

The Executive Committee of the Council at its meeting in December appropriated \$2,000 for the work of the Committee on Franco-American Scholarships for the year 1921. The same sub-committee is in charge of the selection of American candidates for French scholarships. Miss Newcomb and Miss Finn constitute the sub-committee appointed to go to France.

Respectfully submitted,

S. P. CAPEN,

Chairman.

Report of the Committee on Federal Legislation

THE uncertainties of the pre-election period, the change in administration, and the organization of a new Congress, have made the work of the Committee on Federal Legislation the last year more largely that of an observer than would ordinarily be the case.

The Committee has held but one formal meeting, namely, that of November 11, 1920. The Chairman and Secretary, however, have performed certain activities which should properly be reported as part of the Committee's work.

1. The principal new educational bills were reviewed in *THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD* for January, 1921. This number of the RECORD also contained a special article on the Fess-Capper Bill for the Promotion of Physical Education.

2. The referendum on the Smith-Towner Bill was conducted through the Council's office; its results have been summarized and interpreted in *THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD* for April, 1921.

3. The Chairman and the Washington members of the Committee have had frequent conferences with the promoters of the Smith-Towner Bill and with its Congressional sponsors, and with the proponents of other important pieces of educational legislation.

4. The office of the Council has been responsible for considerable publicity bearing on the problems of the Smith-Towner Bill and on the general principles of federal participation in education. Part of this has been through published articles of the Secretary of the Committee.

The Committee has investigated the resolution of the American Chemical Society suggesting that scientific supplies for educational use be not exempted from duty, and is convinced that the resolution does not represent fairly the atti-

tude either of American scientists or American manufacturers. It has therefore opposed the removal of the exemption.

At the present time the Committee has under consideration the Bill introduced by Senator Kenyon creating a Department of Social Welfare and the plan for a Department of Public Welfare as outlined by the administration through General Sawyer. Yesterday a revised bill was introduced by Senator Kenyon, after conference with General Sawyer, providing for a Department of Public Welfare.

In an address at the Engineers' Club, in Philadelphia, on April 16, Mr. Hoover said:

"To any student of federal organization one sweeping and fundamental necessity stands out above all others, and that is, that the administrative units of the Government must be regrouped so as to give each of the great departments more nearly a single purpose."

This emphatic declaration by Mr. Hoover, the creation of a joint committee of Congress on reorganization of the executive departments, and the administration's pledge to create a Department of Public Welfare, all point to some re-alignment of the departments of the Government in the near future.

If we are to improve the status of education in national affairs we must take advantage of the present movement for reorganization and secure for education a place of proper dignity and influence. As to just how this can be accomplished will be considered by the committee at a meeting this evening, and any suggestions as to what attitude the committee should take with reference to the administration's plan of making education a bureau of a Department of Public Welfare, will be welcomed.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN H. MACCRACKEN.

Chairman.

Report of Committee on International Educational Relations

THE Committee on International Educational Relations has held two meetings during the past year, on October 29, 1920, and May 2, 1921, respectively. The matters under discussion at the first meeting were the various appeals for aid to students and professors in European countries. The Committee recommended joint action with the Institute of International Education and the American University Union in Europe in endorsing statements to be issued to college and university officers in connection with the drive made by welfare agencies for European relief work under the direction of Mr. Hoover. Subsequently a joint statement was drawn up by the officers of the Council, the Institute, and the Union, and circulated to colleges and universities.

Three sub-committees of the Committee have been active during the present year: a Committee on the Equivalence of French and American Degrees and Certificates, a Committee on British Academic Credentials, and a Committee on Latin-American Academic Credentials. The report of the Committee on Equivalence of French Degrees and Certificates was published in *THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD* for July, 1920. The report of the Committee on British Academic Credentials was published in *THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD* for April, 1921. Both of these reports were submitted in advance of publication to the deans of the principal graduate schools for criticism. They were published only after receiving the approval of a considerable majority of these officials.

The Committee on Latin-American Academic Credentials has held one meeting and has drafted a preliminary report. Certain disagreements among its members concerning one

of the major recommendations which have not yet been composed have delayed the publication of the report.

The second meeting of the Committee, held May 2, 1921, was devoted to a consideration of the educational situation of Mexico. Dr. Frank Bohn and Dr. George B. Winton, of New York, appeared before the Committee and urged the desirability of immediate concerted action by American educational interests and philanthropists to aid Mexico in the establishment of a successful educational system and to promote the professional training of prospective leaders of Mexican life in the United States. They emphasized certain facts not generally appreciated by the American people. For example, 85 per cent of the population of Mexico is illiterate. Under the revolution existing school systems were very largely destroyed. Even university and professional education, which dates back to the early history of the country, has suffered severe reversals. The present Government is alive to the position of education as the primary factor in stabilizing Mexican national life. Large increases in educational appropriations have been made. A measure has been passed looking toward the creation of an effective federal educational system. The human instruments to put such a system into operation, however, are largely lacking. Teachers of all grades are needed before a beginning can be made. Schemes of training, especially in the applied sciences, must be evolved. The few leaders in Mexican education look to the United States for assistance.

The Committee recommended to the Executive Committee of the Council the appointment, in conjunction with the Institute of International Education, of a new standing committee on Educational Cooperation in Mexico.

Respectfully submitted,

HERMAN V. AMES,

Chairman.

Report of the Special Committee on Policy

I. The Committee recommends that this conference approve the formulation of common statements of standards of higher educational institutions of the whole country—colleges, technological institutions, junior colleges, and institutions primarily for the training of teachers, for the following reasons:

1. To remedy the existing diversity of standards and statements among standardizing agencies, and the confusion arising therefrom.
2. To supply the lack of such statements in certain sections of the country.
3. To aid associations and institutions now compelled to deal with students from all parts of the United States, and also State departments of education dealing with certification of teachers.

II. It recommends that the Council request the U. S. Bureau of Education to publish at once a full statement of the present standards of the chief accrediting agencies now active, and a tabulation of the institutions accredited by these agencies.

III. It recommends that the Council transmit from this conference to these agencies suggested unified statements of standards for various types of institutions, for discussion and report as to the possibility of the adoption of such statements by these agencies within the next two years, such unified statements to be drafted by a committee to be appointed by the Council, from the chief accrediting agencies.

IV. It recommends that the conference approve the unification of the present lists by the same committee as soon as these various agencies can be brought into accord in the matter of common statements of minimum standards.

V. It recommends that the Council serve as the coordinating agency for further conference, for formulation and for dissemination of definite common standards, and for promoting the unification here approved.

F. W. NICOLSON, *Chairman*
FREDERICK E. BOLTON
K. C. BABCOCK
W. W. GUTH
A. C. FOX, S.J.
JOHN L. SEATON
OSCAR H. WILLIAMS
GEORGE F. ZOOK.

New Federal Legislation

IN the last issue of THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD there appeared a summary and analysis of the Kenyon-Fess Bill providing for a Department of Public Welfare. The action of the Council after the measure had been presented to it at its annual meeting, May 6, was also noted. (See page 75.) Congressional hearings on the measure developed widespread and varied opposition. Of all the elements affected by the bill the educational groups and organizations were, perhaps, most unanimously opposed to it. Their opposition was expressed in most of the leading educational journals, at the hearings of the Senate and House Committees, and in interviews with members of the administration. Whether on account of this opposition or not, the project seems to have been temporarily shelved. In its place Congress passed an Act establishing a Veterans' Bureau. The Act was approved August 9, 1921. Since this Act, at least in a negative way, affects education, the main provisions of it are summarized below:

THE VETERANS' BUREAU

1. An independent Veterans' Bureau is established with a Director at its head. To it are transferred the functions, powers, and duties conferred by preceding legislation upon the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and the functions, powers, and duties conferred upon the Federal Board for Vocational Education in relation to the provision of vocational rehabilitation for persons discharged from the military and naval forces, and the personnel, facilities, property, and equipment of the U. S. Public Health Service, heretofore used in the rehabilitation of wounded soldiers, sailors, and marines. The Bureau of War Risk Insurance of the Treasury Department is abolished.
2. There are made available to the Veterans' Bureau the sums appropriated to the carrying out the work of physical and educational rehabilitation to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, the Federal Board for Vocational Education, and the U. S. Public Health Service.

3. The Director of the Veterans' Bureau "shall be responsible for the proper examination, medical care, treatment, hospitalization, dispensary and convalescent care necessary and reasonable, after care, welfare, nursing, vocational training, and such other services as may be necessary" for veterans injured in the world war.

4. The Veterans' Bureau also has charge of the functions of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance relating to the insurance of persons in the military and naval service.

Membership of the American Council on Education and of its Committee

OFFICERS FOR THE YEAR 1921-22

Chairman.—David Kinley, University of Illinois, representing the National Association of State Universities.

First Vice-Chairman.—E. R. A. Seligman, Columbia University, representing the American Association of University Professors.

Second Vice-Chairman.—Bishop Thomas J. Shahan, Catholic University of America, representing the Catholic Educational Association.

Secretary.—Virginia C. Gildersleeve, Barnard College, representing the American Association of University Women.

Treasurer.—Corcoran Thom, Vice President of the American Security and Trust Company, Washington, D. C.

Director.—Samuel Paul Capen.

Executive Committee.—The Chairman, the Secretary, the Director.

Herman V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania, representing the Association of American Universities.

John H. MacCracken, Lafayette College, representing the Association of American Colleges.

Right Reverend Edward A. Pace, Catholic University of America, representing the Catholic Educational Association.

Raymond A. Pearson, Iowa State College, representing the Association of Land Grant Colleges.

Frederick B. Robinson, College of the City of New York, representing the Association of Urban Universities.

H. W. Tyler, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, representing the American Association of University Professors.

CONSTITUENT MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVES

1. ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES:

Herman V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Ray L. Wilbur, Leland Stanford Jr. University, California.

Harry Pratt Judson, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

2. NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES.

David Kinley, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Robert J. Aley, Butler College, Indianapolis, Ind.

P. L. Campbell, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

3. ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES:

Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.
Rush Rhees, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.
John H. MacCracken, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

4. ASSOCIATION OF URBAN UNIVERSITIES:

F. P. Graves, University of the State of New York, Albany, N. Y.
Frederick B. Robinson, College of the City of New York, N. Y.
Chas. S. Howe, Case School of Applied Science, Cleveland, Ohio.

5. CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION:

Bishop Thomas J. Shahan, Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.
Rev. P. J. McCormick, Catholic University of America, Wash-
ington, D. C.
Right Rev. Edward A. Pace, Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

6. ASSOCIATION OF LAND GRANT COLLEGES:

R. A. Pearson, Iowa State College of Agriculture, Ames, Iowa.
Eugene Davenport, College of Agriculture, University of Illinois,
Urbana, Ill.
W. J. Kerr, Oregon Agricultural College, Corvallis, Oregon.

7. SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF ENGINEERING EDUCATION:

F. L. Bishop, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. J. Tilden, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
C. R. Mann, War Department, Washington, D. C.

8. AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS:

H. W. Tyler, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge,
Mass.
E. R. A. Seligman, Columbia University, New York City.
M. S. Washburn, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

9. AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN:

Mrs. Glen L. Swiggett, The Mendota, Washington, D. C.
Virginia C. Gildersleeve, Barnard College, Columbia University,
New York City.
Ada Comstock, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

10. NATIONAL COUNCIL OF NORMAL SCHOOL PRESIDENTS AND
PRINCIPALS:

D. B. Johnson, Winthrop Normal and Industrial College,
Rockhill, S. C.
D. B. Waldo, Kalamazoo State Normal School, Kalamazoo,
Mich.
J. A. H. Keith, State Normal School, Indiana, Pa.

11. COUNCIL ON MEDICAL EDUCATION AND HOSPITALS OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION:

Surgeon General M. W. Ireland, War Department, Washington, D. C.

N. P. Colwell, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Wm. P. Pepper, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

12. COUNCIL OF CHURCH BOARDS OF EDUCATION:

Robert L. Kelly, 111 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

A. W. Harris, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

H. O. Pritchard, 222 Downey Avenue, Indianapolis, Ind.

13. AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS COLLEGES:

Chas. McKenny, State Normal School, Ypsilanti, Mich.

J. G. Crabbe, State Teachers College of Colorado, Greeley, Colo.

U. S. Conn, State Normal School, Wayne, Nebraska.

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL AND THEIR OFFICIAL REPRESENTATIVES

1. ALUMNI ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RHODES SCHOLARS:

Secretary, Frank Aydelotte, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.

2. AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE:

Secretary, Burton E. Livingston, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.

3. AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION:

Secretary, Waldo G. Leland, Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

4. THE AMERICAN SCANDINAVIAN FOUNDATION:

Secretary, Henry G. Leach, 25 West 45th Street, New York City.

5. ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE SCHOOLS OF ARCHITECTURE:

Secretary, C. A. Martin, Ithaca, New York.

6. RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION:

Secretary, H. D. Cope, 1032 East 55th Street, Chicago, Ill.

7. NATIONAL INSTITUTION FOR MORAL INSTRUCTION:

Milton Fairchild, 3770 McKinley St., Washington, D. C.

8. NATIONAL CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS:

Secretary, F. W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

9. MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA:

Secretary, Carleton Brown, 1199 Raymond Avenue, St. Paul, Minn.

10. AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE REGISTRARS:
 Secretary, Raymond Walters, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.

11. NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL:
 Secretary, Vernon Kellogg, 1701 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D. C.

12. SOCIETY OF COLLEGE TEACHERS OF EDUCATION:
 Secretary: Florence E. Bamberger, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

ALABAMA:	INDIANA:
Alabama Polytechnic Institute.	Butler College
ARIZONA:	DePauw University
University of Arizona	Indiana University
CALIFORNIA:	Rose Polytechnic Institute
Leland Stanford Jr. University	University of Notre Dame
Mills College	St. Mary of the Woods College
Occidental College	St. Mary's College
Pomona College	IOWA:
University of Southern California	Coe College
nia	Cornell College
COLORADO:	Des Moines University
Colorado College	Grinnell College
Colorado State Teachers College	Iowa State Teachers College
University of Colorado	Luther College
CONNECTICUT:	KANSAS:
Wesleyan University	Baker University
Yale University	Washburn College
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA:	KENTUCKY:
Catholic University of America	Center College
George Washington University	Georgetown College
GEORGIA:	University of Kentucky
Brenau College	Transylvania College
ILLINOIS:	MARYLAND:
De Paul University	Goucher College
James Millikin University	Johns Hopkins University
Knox College	Maryland College for Women
Northwestern University	University of Maryland
Rockford College	MASSACHUSETTS:
University of Chicago	Boston College
University of Illinois	Boston University

MASSACHUSETTS—Continued:

Radcliffe College
Smith College
Tufts College
Wellesley College
Wheaton College

MICHIGAN:

Albion College
Alma College
University of Detroit
Kalamazoo College
University of Michigan

MINNESOTA:

Carleton College
College of St. Catherine
St. Olaf College
College of St. Teresa
College of St. Thomas
Hamline University
Macalester College
University of Minnesota:

MISSOURI:

Kirkville State Teachers College
Southeast Missouri State Teachers College
University of Missouri

MONTANA:

University of Montana

NEW HAMPSHIRE:

Dartmouth College

NEW JERSEY:

College of St. Elizabeth
Stevens Institute of Technology

NEW YORK:

Alfred University
Colgate University
Columbia University
Hamilton College
Manhattan College
New York University
University of Rochester

NEW YORK—Continued:

Vassar College
Wells College

NORTH CAROLINA:

Elon College
St. Genevieve's College
University of North Carolina

OHIO:

Case School of Applied Science
Defiance College
Denison University
Lake Erie College
Marietta College
Miami University
Municipal University of Akron
Muskingum College
Oberlin College
Ohio State University
Ohio Wesleyan University
Western College for Women
Western Reserve University

OREGON

University of Oregon

PENNSYLVANIA:

Allegheny College
Bryn Mawr College
Carnegie Institute of Technology
Drexel Institute
Dropsie College
Grove City College
Haverford College
Lafayette College
Lehigh University
Temple University
University of Pennsylvania
University of Pittsburgh

SOUTH CAROLINA:

Winthrop Normal and Industrial College

SOUTH DAKOTA:

Huron College
University of South Dakota

TENNESSEE:

Southwestern Presbyterian University

TEXAS:

Baylor University
College of Industrial Arts
University of Texas

VERMONT:

Middlebury College
University of Vermont

VIRGINIA:

Sweet Briar College
University of Virginia
College of William and Mary

WISCONSIN:

Beloit College
Campion College
Lawrence College
Marquette University
Milwaukee Downer College
St. Clara College
Ripon College

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL
ON EDUCATION¹

COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION:

J. H. MacCracken, *Chairman*
H. P. Judson
R. E. Vinson
M. L. Burton
H. C. King
Frank L. McVey
Right Rev. Edward A. Pace
W. F. Willoughby

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL RELATIONS:

Herman V. Ames, *Chairman*
S. P. Duggan
John H. Finley
Paul Monroe
Charles H. Rieber
Leo S. Rowe
Anson Phelps Stokes

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE RATING OF BRITISH ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS:

S. P. Duggan
A. O. Leuschner
Herman V. Ames
K. Lake
Charles H. Haskins
F. J. F. Jackson
I. L. Kandel
Frank Aydelotte
J. W. Cunliffe

¹ The Director is, under the Constitution, an ex-officio member of all standing committees.

SUB-COMMITTEE ON FRENCH AND AMERICAN DEGREES AND CERTIFICATES:

Herman V. Ames
Stephen P. Duggan
John H. Finley
Paul Monroe
Charles H. Rieber
Leo S. Rowe
Anson Phelps Stokes
Edward C. Armstrong
Henry Bargy
Julien J. Champenois
Gilbert Chinard
J. W. Cunliffe
John Erskine
Henri Guy
Adam Leroy Jones
I. L. Kandel
Robert L. Kelly
Jules LeGras
Andre Morize
Raymond Weeks
F. J. E. Woodbridge

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE RATING OF LATIN-AMERICAN ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS:

Herman V. Ames
P. A. Martin
Wm. R. Shepherd
E. E. Brandon
G. A. Sherwell
F. J. Yanes
S. P. Duggan
S. G. Inman

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION FOR CITIZENSHIP:

M. L. Burton, *Chairman*
S. B. Harding
Ernest C. Moore
J. C. Withers
Rev. John O'Grady
Guy S. Ford
C. R. Mann
A. W. Dunn

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION FOR CITIZENSHIP—*Continued:*

A. E. McKinley
F. A. Cleveland
Mary E. Woolley
Katherine P. Pomeroy
George F. Zook
J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton
E. W. Knight

COMMITTEE ON FRANCO-AMERICAN EXCHANGE OF SCHOLARSHIPS AND
FELLOWSHIPS:

S. P. Capen, *Chairman*
Herman V. Ames
Wm. L. Bryan
Julien J. Champenois
J. W. Cunliffe
S. P. Duggan
Mary M. Finn
Virginia C. Gildersleeve
I. L. Kandel
Robert L. Kelly
Margaret E. Maltby
Virginia Newcomb

COMMITTEE ON COOPERATION WITH INDUSTRIES:

F. L. Bishop, *Chairman*
F. C. Ferry
P. R. Kolbe
C. R. Mann

COMMITTEE ON TRAINING OF WOMEN FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICE:

Mrs. Gertrude S. Martin, *Chairman*
Mrs. R. B. Morgan
Elizabeth K. Adams
Emma P. Hirth
Agnes L. Rogers
M. A. Bigelow

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL AUXILIARY LANGUAGE:

Irving Fisher
Raymond Weeks
Herman Collitz
Kenneth McKenzie
Wm. A. Nitze
Frederick Klaeber

COMMITTEE ON COOPERATING SOCIETIES:

H. W. Tyler, *Chairman*

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE:

Donald J. Cowling, *Chairman*
Bishop T. J. Shahan
Marion L. Burton

COMMITTEE ON COLLEGE STANDARDS:

F. W. Nicolson
Adam Leroy Jones
James H. Kirkland
K. C. Babcock
F. E. Bolton
Rev. A. C. Fox, S. J.
John L. Seaton
Oscar H. Williams
George F. Zook
F. L. Bishop

